PĀṆINIAN INTERPRETATION
OF THE
SANSKRIT LANGUAGE

DR. NARENDRA CHANDRA NATH

BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY SANSKRIT SERIES

Vol. II

Editor

DR SIDDHESHWAR BHATTACHARYA
M.A. (Hons.), Ph.D. (London), D.Litt. (Lille),
Bar-at-Law, (Gray's Inn), *Kāvya-Tīrtha,*
Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika-Ācārya (*Gold-medallist*) ;
Director of Sanskrit Studies & Research, Mayurbhanj
Professor & Head of the Department of Sanskrit & Pali,
BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY.

PĀṆINIAN INTERPRETATION
OF THE
SANSKRIT LANGUAGE

A D.Litt. thesis prepared with the award of Senior Research Fellowship of the University Grants Commission, Govt. of India (1964-67).

by

DR NARENDRA CHANDRA NATH

M.A. (Sanskrit), M.A. (English), Ph.D., *Kāvya-Tīrtha,*

Mayurbhanj Scholar (1961), Research Scholar in Humanities,

Ministry of Education, Government of India (1961-63),

Senior Research Fellow, U.G.C. (1964-67),

Lecturer, Department of Sanskrit & Pali,

BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY,

VARANASI-5.

1969.

Published by
BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY

First Edition
February, 1969.

Price : ~~Rupees Thirty only~~
200/-

Printed by
R. K. BERRY
at the Banaras Hindu University Press.
Varanasi-5

FOREWORD

In the trail of "A Literary Study of the Campū-Rāmāyaṇa" by Dr Karuna Srivastava, published last year, the "Pāṇinian Interpretation of the Sanskrit Language" by Dr N. C. Nath is being presented as the second publication under the BHU Sanskrit Series.

The present endeavour has a speciality of its own. It is an honest attempt towards the fulfilment of an academic desideratum pronounced as early as 1879 by W. D. Whitney in his Sanskrit Grammar—

> "The time must soon come, or it has come already, when the endeavour shall be instead to explain the grammar from the language : to test in all details, so far as shall be found possible, the reason of Pāṇini's rules (which contain not a little that seems problematical, or even sometimes perverse) ; to determine what and how much genuine usage be had everywhere as foundation, and what traces may be left in the literature of usages possessing an inherently authorized character, though unratified by him".

Success in this direction is left to the judgement of the scholarly world.

The author himself has borne the brunt of seeing the publication through the Press. The quality of printing is an eloquent testimony to the best co-operation available from the B.H.U. Press.

Any inaccuracies may kindly be brought to the notice of the editor to the benefit of the Series itself.

B.H.U. Dr S. BHATTACHARYA

February 3, 1969.

PREFACE

The omissions and commissions in the Pāṇinian system of grammar have been the subject-matter of the present volume.

After obtaining the Ph.D. degree of the Banaras Hindu University on comparative linguistics in April 1964, I had applied for a Senior Research Fellowship of the U.G.C., being encouraged for higher research by Dr S. Bhattacharya, M.A., Ph.D. (London), D.Litt,. (Lille), Bar-at-law etc., the Head of the Department of Sanskrit and Pali, Banaras Hindu University. The application was sponsored by the Banaras Hindu University with due recommendations from Dr S. Bhattacharya.

Thereafter I was contacting other agencies also seeking opportunities for further research. Suddenly I was invited by the Vishweshwarananda Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur (Punjab). In mid-July 1964 I rushed to Hoshiarpur and there came to know from Acharya Vishwabandhu Shastri, M.A., D.Litt., the Hony. Director of the Institute, that I had been awarded a Senior Research Fellowship of U.G.C.

Upon this, I retraced my steps to Varanasi, and joined the Banaras Hindu University on 24th July 1964 as a D.Litt. researcher. Though under the B.H.U. rules D.Litt. research requires no guidance, yet U.G.C. Fellowship rules require it, and guidance from a master-mind is always to one's benefit. Dr Bhattacharya, Head of the Deptt. of Sanskrit & Pali, very kindly undertook to guide me in my work. Since then I have worked under his sage guidance to the last.

My work has been on *Pāṇinian Interpretation of the Sanskrit Language,* because I saw Pāṇini's rules had been obeyed without question throughout the past centuries but had never been tested on the touch-stone of literature and linguistics. I thought I could render more service to the cause of Sanskrit language by testing those time-honoured aphorisms than by undertaking a literary estimate of some poetical work.

The work was completed by July 1967. Now, the Banaras Hindu University rules require that a D.Litt. thesis must be submitted in printed form. I had not the money ; nor could I find out an agency for help. At this juncture Dr Bhattacharya again came forward as the silver lining. He accepted my thesis for publication from the Research Publication Scheme in Sanskrit, whereof he is the Director. But for this very kind act of his, the thesis would have hardly seen the light of day.

The thesis was submitted to the Banaras Hindu University Press for printing in March 1968 and by February 1969 the printing was complete.

I acknowledge my deep debt of gratitude to my Supervisor Guru Dr S. Bhattacharya for the constant inspiration and guidance that I have received from him in course of this work. But for his precious counsel at every step, his sustained efforts for the overall success of the work, and his watchful eyes, the work could hardly have taken its present shape. Even the proof-sheets have received his final corrections.

My thanks are due also to Dr K. C. Jain, and Dr K. P. Singh, both of the Department of Sanskrit & Pali, for rendering valuable help, at the initial stage, in proof-reading and negotiation with the Press ; Shri S. P. Bhattacharya, B.Com., Office Assistant of the Department, who, on many occasions, helped me in receiving and despatching the proof-sheets in the shortest time ; the painstaking workers of the B.H.U. Press for careful and neat printing ; and lastly many other scholars and friends who may have directly or indirectly encouraged me in this work.

Banaras Hindu University, N. C. NATH
February, 1969.

CONTENTS

		Pages
FOREWORD	... ...	v
PREFACE	... ...	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	... ...	xiii
INTRODUCTION	... ...	xxi
CHAPTER I:	BORROWED VOCABULARY	
	1. Silence of Pāṇini	5
	2. Recognition by Kumārila Bhaṭṭa ...	5
	3. Recognition by modern philologists ...	6
	4. General characteristics of borrowed words ...	6
	5. Sources of borrowing	9
	6. Conclusion	10
CHAPTER II:	UNORIGINAL SIBILANTS: ALTERNATION BETWEEN *Ś*, *S*	
	7. Alternation not noted by Pāṇini ...	13
	8. Originality of spellings (with *ś*, *s*) examined	14
	9. Unoriginality known from cognate forms alone	25
	10. Reason behind optional use of *ś*, *s* ...	25
	11. Conclusion	26
CHAPTER III:	TERMS & THEIR DEFINITIONS	
	12. Too wide definitions	29
	13. Too narrow definitions	32
	14. Non-definition	36
	15. Vague definitions	36
	16. Miscellaneous	39
CHAPTER IV:	CLASSIFICATION OF SUFFIXES—HOW FAR JUSTIFIED	
	17. No different sets of suffixes	43
	18. Examples of classlessness	43
	19. Conclusion	48

Pages

CHAPTER V: KṚT

20. Unwarranted presumption 51
21. Non-recognition 52
22. Misinterpretation 54
23. Un-Pāṇinian usages 55
24. Lack of uniformity 60
25. Miscellaneous 65

CHAPTER VI: TADDHITA

26. Unwarranted presumption 69
27. Repetition 77
28. *Tadddhita* affix VS *samāsa* 78
29. Lack of uniformity 79
30. Miscellaneous 80

CHAPTER VII: AUGMENTS (ĀGAMA)

31. Augment and suffix confused 85
32. Unwarranted presumption 86

CHAPTER VIII: SUBSTITUTION (ĀDEŚA)

33. Unacceptable substitutes 95
34. *Ādeśa* and *āgama* confused 104
35. *Ādeśa* and suffix confused 105

CHAPTER IX: ELISION (LOPA ETC.)

36. *Lakṣaṇā* misinterpreted 109
37. Primary suffixes regarded secondary ... 111
38. Utter suffixlessness not noted 112
39. Wrong suffix 112
40. Wrong stem 113
41. Wrong case-form 114
42. Wrong *samāsa* 114
43. Genderless masculine not noted 114
44. Conclusion 116

CHAPTER X: COMPOUNDS (SAMĀSA)

45. Limitations of *samāsa*—how far justified ... 121
46. *Saha-supā* not a class of compound ... 128

CHAPTER XI: DECLENSION

47. *Sup*-endings not universally applicable ... 133
48. Un-Pāṇinian case-forms 136

Pages

CHAPTER XII: CONJUGATION ... ...

49. Difficult procedure 141
50. *Vikaraṇas* not recognised 145
51. Unnecessary admission of *vikaraṇas* ... 145
52. Questionable *gaṇa* of some roots ... 146
53. Un-Pāṇinian verb-forms 148

CHAPTER XIII: ĀTMANEPADA–PARASMAIPADA

54. Violation of rules by ancient authors ... 153
55. What do the violations indicate : Undue restrictions 162
56. The evidence of Greek 164
57. Other considerations 165
58. Conclusion 166

CHAPTER XIV: USE OF TENSES & MOODS

59. *Luṭ* as a *lakāra* inadmissible 169
60. Uses not noted in Pāṇini 170
61. Miscellaneous 175

CHAPTER XV: THE USE OF CASE–ENDINGS

62. Un-Pāṇinian use of case-endings ... 181
63. Unaccounted for case-endings 198
64. Questionable explanations 200
65. Exclusion of synonyms 203
66. Vagueness about use of *ṣaṣṭhī* 204

THE LAST WORD 209

APPENDIX 213

BIBLIOGRAPHY 221

INDEX 229

ABBREVIATIONS

1. WORKS AND AUTHORS

Ag-P.	=	Agni-Purāṇa
Āgni-Gṛ.	=	Āgniveśya-gṛhya-sūtra
Ait-Ār.	=	Aitareya-Āraṇyaka
Ait-Br.	=	Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa
Amar.	=	Amara-koṣa
Āpa-Dh.	=	Āpastamba-dharma-sūtra
Āpa-Gṛ.	=	Āpastamba-gṛhya-sūtra
Āpa-M.	=	Āpastamba-mantra-pāṭha
A-Pariś.	=	Atharva-Pariśiṣṭa
Āpa-Śr.	=	Āpastamba-śrauta-sūtra
A-Prā.	=	Atharva-Prātiśākhya
A-Prāy.	=	Atharva-Prāyaścitta
Arth-Ś.	=	Artha-śāstra
Āśv-Gṛ.	=	Āśvalāyana-gṛhya-sūtra
Āśv-Śr.	=	Āśvalāyana-śrauta-sūtra
Baudh-Dh.	=	Baudhāyana-dharma-sūtra
Baudh-Gṛ.	=	Baudhāyana-gṛhya-sūtra
Baudh-Pi.	=	Baudhāyana-pitṛmedha-sūtra
Baudh-Śr.	=	Baudhāyana-śrauta-sūtra
Bhāg.	=	Bhāgavata
Bhām.	=	Bhāminī-vilāsa
Bhār-Gṛ.	=	Bhāradvāja-gṛhya-sūtra
Bhār-Śr.	=	Bhāradvāja-śrauta-sūtra
Bhaṭṭi.	=	Bhaṭṭi-kāvya
Bhava-S-Up.	=	Bhava-santāraṇa-Upaniṣad
Bh-Pr.	=	Bhāva-prakāśa
Brah.	=	Brahma-sūtra
Bṛh-Ār-Up.	=	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad
Bṛh-Dev.	=	Bṛhad-devatā
Bṛh-S.	=	Bṛhat-saṁhitā
Bṛh-Up.	=	Bṛhajjābāla-Upaniṣad
Cakr-Up.	=	Cakra-Upaniṣad
Cāṇ.	=	Cāṇakya
Cār.	=	Cārudatta

CD.	=	Century Dictionary by W.D. Whitney
Ch-Up.	=	Chāndogya-Upaniṣad
Daiv-Br.	=	Daivata-Brāhmaṇa
Devībh.	=	Devī-bhāgavata
Drāhy.	=	Drāhyāyaṇa-śrauta-sūtra
DSS.	=	Dictionary of Selected Synonyms from the Principal Indo-European Languages by C.D. Buck
G.	=	Gītā
Gaṇ.	=	Gaṇa-pāṭha
Gaut-Dh.	=	Gautama-dharma-sūtra
Gāy-Up.	=	Gāyatrī-rahasya-Upaniṣad
Gobh-Gṛ.	=	Gobhila-gṛhya-sūtra
Gop-Br.	=	Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa
Haṁs-Up.	=	Haṁsa-Upaniṣad
Hir-Gṛ.	=	Hiraṇyakeśi-gṛhya-sūtra
Hir-Śr.	=	Hiraṇyakeśi-śrauta-sūtra
Hit.	=	Hitopadeśa
Iti-Up.	=	Itihāsa-Upaniṣad
Jai-Ārṣ-Br.	=	Jaiminīya-Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa
Jai-Br.	=	Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa
Jai-S.	=	Jainimīya-Saṁhitā
Jai-Śr-K.	=	Jaiminīya-śrauta-sūtra-kārikā
Jai-up-Br.	=	Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa
Kāl-P.	=	Kālikā-Purāṇa
Kāl-Up.	=	Kālikā-Upaniṣad
Kāṇ-S.	=	Kāṇva-Saṁhitā
Kapiṣṭh.	=	Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṁhitā
Kāś.	=	Kāśikā
Kāś-Dh.	=	Kāśyapa-dharma-sūtra
Kathās.	=	Kathā-sarit-sāgara
Kāṭh-Gṛ.	=	Kāṭhaka-gṛhya-sūtra
Kāṭh-S.	=	Kāṭhaka-Saṁhitā
Kaṭh-Up.	=	Kaṭha-Upaniṣad
Kāty-Śr.	=	Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtra
Kauś.	=	Kauśika-sūtra
Kauṣ-Gṛ.	=	Kauṣītaki-gṛhya-sūtra
Kauth-S.	=	Kauthuma-Saṁhitā
Ken-Up.	=	Kena-Upaniṣad

Kirāt.	=	Kirātārjunīya
K-r-up.	=	Kaṭha-rudra-Upaniṣad
Kṣud.	=	Kṣudra-sūtra
K-Ś-Up.	=	Kaṭha-śruti-Upaniṣad
Kumār.	=	Kumāra-sambhava
Kuṇḍ-Up.	=	Kuṇḍikā-Upaniṣad
Lāṭy.	=	Lāṭyāyana-śrauta-sūtra
LSL.	=	Lectures on the Science of Language by F. Max Müller
Mah-Nār-Up.	=	Mahā-nārāyaṇa-Upaniṣad
Mah-Up.	=	Mahā-Upaniṣad
Malli.	=	Mallinātha
Mān-Gṛ.	=	Mānava-gṛhya-sūtra
Mān-Śr.	=	Mānava-śrauta-sūtra
Mārk-P.	=	Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa
Matsy-P.	=	Matsya-Purāṇa
MBh.	=	Mahābhārata
Mbhāṣ.	=	Mahābhāṣya
Megh.	=	Meghadūta
Mn.	=	Manu-Smṛti
Moham.	=	Moha-mudgara
Mṛc.	=	Mṛcchakaṭika
Mṛty-Up.	=	Mṛtyu-lāṅgula-Upaniṣad
MS.	=	Maitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā
Mukt-Up.	=	Muktikā-Upaniṣad
Naiṣ.	=	Naiṣadhīya-carita
Nār-P-Up.	=	Nārada-parivrājaka-Upaniṣad
Nār-Up.	=	Nārāyaṇa-pūrva-tāpinī-Upaniṣad
Nāṭyaś.	=	Nāṭya-śāstra
Nir.	=	Nirukta
Nṛs-P-Up.	=	Nṛsiṁha-pūrva-tāpinī-Upaniṣad
Padam.	=	Pada-mañjarī of Haradatta
Padma-P.	=	Padma-Purāṇa
Paipp-S.	=	Paippalāda-Saṁhitā
Pañcad.	=	Pañcadaśī
Pañcar.	=	Pañca-rātra
Pañcat.	=	Pañca-tantra
Pāṇ.	=	Pāṇini-sūtra
Pār-Gṛ.	=	Pāraskara-gṛhya-sūtra

Piṇḍ-Br-Up.	=	Piṇḍa-brahmāṇḍa-Upaniṣad
Piṅg-Up.	=	Piṅgalā-Upaniṣad
Prad.	=	Pradīpa of Kaiyaṭa
Pratijñā-Y.	=	Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa
Pratimā.	=	Pratimā-nāṭaka
R.	=	Rāmāyaṇa
Ragh.	=	Raghu-vaṁśa
Rāja-Ś-Up.	=	Rāja-śyāmala-rahasya-Upaniṣad
Rājat.	=	Rāja-taraṅgiṇī
Rām-rah.	=	Rāma-rahasya-Upaniṣad
Rām-tāp.	=	Rāma-pūrva-tāpinī-Upaniṣad
Ṛk-Prā.	=	Ṛk-Prātiśākhya
Rudr-Up.	=	Rudra-jābāla-Upaniṣad
RV.	=	Ṛg-Veda-Saṁhitā
Śabd-Kau.	=	Śabda-Kaustubha
Ṣaḍ-Br.	=	Ṣaḍ-viṁśa-Brāhmaṇa
Sāh.	=	Sāhitya-darpaṇa
Śak.	=	Śākuntala
Sāṁkhy.	=	Sāṁkhya-sūtra
Sāṁkhy-K.	=	Sāmkhya-Kārikā
Śaṅkh-Dh.	=	Śaṅkha-likhita-dharma-sūtra
Śāṅkh-Ār.	=	Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka
Śāṅkh-Br.	=	Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa
Śāṅkh-Gṛ.	=	Śāṅkhāyana-gṛhya-sūtra
Śāṅkh-Śr.	=	Śāṅkhāyana-śrauta-sūtra
Sans. Gram., Grammar.	=	Sanskrit Grammar by W. D. Whitney
Sans. Lang.	=	Sanskrit Language by T. Burrow
Śar-Up.	=	Śarabha-Upaniṣad
Śaun-cat.	=	Śaunaka-caturādhyāyī
Śaun-S.	=	Śaunaka-Saṁhitā
Sāy.	=	Sāyaṇa
ŚBr.	=	Śata-patha-Brāhmaṇa
SED.	=	Sanskrit English Dictionary by M. Monier Williams
Śiś.	=	Śiśupāla-vadha
Śivas.	=	Śiva-svarodaya
Śiv-Up.	=	Śiva-Upaniṣad
SK.	=	Siddhānta-kaumudī
ŚKD.	=	Śabda-kalpa-druma

Sk-P.	=	Skanda-Purāṇa
Subh.	=	Subhāṣitāvalī
S-Up.	=	Sannyāsa-Upaniṣad
Suparn.	=	Suparṇādhyāya
Svap.	=	Svapna-vāsavadatta
Śvet-Up.	=	Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad
SW.	=	Sanskrit Worterbuch by Roth and Böhtlingk
Tāṇḍ.	=	Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa
Tantras.	=	Tantra-sāra
Tantrav.	=	Tantra-vārtika
T-Ār.	=	Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka
T-Br.	=	Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa
TS.	=	Taittirīya-Saṁhitā
Ud.	=	Udbhaṭa-sāgara
Uṇ.	=	Uṇādi-sūtra
Upan-S.	=	Upanidāna-sūtra
Uttar.	=	Uttara-rāma-carita
Vādh-Śr.	=	Vādhūla-śrauta-sūtra
Vaikh-Dh.	=	Vaikhānasa-dharma-sūtra
Vaikh-Gṛ.	=	Vaikhānasa-gṛhya-sūtra
Vaikh-Śr.	=	Vaikhānasa-śrauta-sūtra
Vait-Śr.	=	Vaitāna-śrauta-sūtra
Vajras-Up.	=	Vajra-sūcikā-Upaniṣad
Vāky.	=	Vākya-padīya
Vanad-Up.	=	Vana-durgā-Upaniṣad
Vār-Śr.	=	Vārāha-śrauta-sūtra
Vārt.	=	Vārtika-sūtra
Vās-Dh.	=	Vāsiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra
Veṇīs.	=	Veṇī-saṁhāra
Veṅkaṭ	=	Veṅkaṭa-mādhava
Vi-Dh.	=	Viṣṇu-dharma-sūtra
Vikr.	=	Vikramorvaśī
VK.	=	Viśva-koṣa
VP.	=	Viṣṇu-Purāṇa
VPK.	=	Vaidika-padānukrama-koṣa by Vishwabandhu Shastri
VS.	=	Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā
Yoga-K-Up.	=	Yoga-kuṇḍalī-Upaniṣad

2. MISCELLANEOUS

abl.	=	ablative
acc.	=	accusative
Ar.	=	Arabic
AS.	=	Anglo-Saxon
Av.	=	Avestan
dat.	=	dative
dial.	=	dialect
du.	=	dual
fem.	=	feminine
Finn.	=	Finnish
G.	=	German
gen.	=	genitive
Gk.	=	Greek
Goth.	=	Gothic
Hung.	=	Hungarian
IE.	=	Indo-European
instr.	=	instrumental
Kan.	=	Kannaḍa
L.	=	Latin
Lapp.	=	Lappish
lit.	=	literally
loc.	=	locative
Mal.	=	Malayan
masc.	=	masculine
Mg.	=	Mongol
Morv.	=	Morvian
neut.	=	neuter
nom.	=	nominative
orig.	=	originally, original
Ost.	=	Ostiak
plur.	=	plural
Pkt.	=	Prākṛta
prob.	=	probably
sing.	=	singular
Skt.	=	Sanskrit
suff.	=	suffix
Syl.	=	Sylhetti (i.e., the Bengali dialect of Sylhet, Cachar and Tripura).

Tam.	=	Tamil
Tib.	=	Tibetan
Tu.	=	Tulu
Tung.	=	Tungusian
Turk.	=	Turkish
Ugr.	=	Ugrian
Uig.	=	Uigur
voc.	=	vocative

INTRODUCTION

THE WORK

THE DATA

METHOD OF APPROACH

PĀṆINI AND PĀṆINIAN INTERPRETATION

DEPARTURES FROM THE TRADITIONAL VIEWS

INTRODUCTION

1. THE WORK

In the introduction to his *Sanskrit Grammar* William Dwight Whitney makes the following observation: "The time must soon come, or it has come already, when the endeavour shall be to explain the grammar from the language, to test in all details, so far as shall be found possible, the reason of *Pāṇini's rules, which contain not a little that seems problematical, or even sometimes perverse;* to determine what and how much genuine usage he had everywhere as foundation, and what traces may be left in the literature of usages possessing an inherently authorised character, though unratified by him.[1]"

Defects in the Pāṇinian system

But neither Whitney nor any other scholar has elaborated what these 'problematical' and 'perverse' elements in Pāṇini are. The need existed, therefore, for a full-scale treatment of the 'problematical' and 'perverse' portions of Pāṇini, and the present work is a modest venture in that direction with the help, among other things, of comparative philology, which was unknown in the days of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali.

Critical work on Pāṇini—a desideratum

2. THE DATA

Pāṇini has spoken of two branches of the Sanskrit language—*chandas* and *bhāṣā*—whereof he has written the grammar. By *chandas*, is usually understood the language of the Veda, and by *bhāṣā*, the post-Vedic Sanskrit, although more properly they should mean poetry and prose respectively. For, *chandas* cannot denote the entire Veda consisting of poetry and prose, and *bhāṣā* cannot denote the metrical portion of post-Vedic literature, because nobody speaks in poetry. Therefore it is doubtful what Pāṇini really meant by those terms (*chandas* and *bhāṣā*).

Pāṇini's grammar covers *chandas* and *bhāṣā* Sanskrit

---

[1] Vide Whitney's Introduction to his *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. XIV. Barend Faddegon in his *Studies on Pāṇini's Grammar* has, obviously in reply to this criticism by Whitney, remarked—"Whitney has admirably attacked Pāṇini, but for Pāṇini we forget Whitney." True, but it does not mean that Pāṇini is altogether flawless. Had it been so, there would never have been a Kātyāyana, never a Patañjali. Faddegon also tacitly admits it when he says '*admirably* attacked Pāṇini'.

Now, the question is whether the Epic or Purāṇic language has been included in these *chandas* and *bhāṣā*. If it is included, it is expected to conform to Pāṇinian rules. But this is not the case. The Purāṇic language very often violates Pāṇini's rules. This shows that the type of language represented in the Epics and Purāṇas has not received due consideration in Pāṇini. But Sanskrit is not the language of Veda and kāvya alone. The great Epics and the extensive Purāṇa literature cannot be thrown away as unworthy of the name 'Sanskrit'.

Epic or Purāṇic Sanskrit not covered by Pāṇini's rules

It has been the custom to look upon the un-Pāṇinian Purāṇic uses as *ārṣa-prayoga*, which is a milder term for 'mistakes'.[1] This is hardly justifiable. It cannot be admitted that the Purāṇa texts are replete with grammatical mistakes, that their authors were ignorant of grammar. Rather it is the Purāṇic language which has the most natural flow and the most appealing tone.

Is Epic Sanskrit full of grammatical errors?

The Purāṇic language, as also the Purāṇas themselves, has not received due appreciation as yet, and it is customary to look upon the meticulously Pāṇinian, studied kāvyas and dramas of the classical period as the best specimen of Sanskrit composition. But judged properly, kāvya Sanskrit, barring a few pieces, is the backwater of Sanskrit composition. Sanskrit shines in its original, beautiful form in the Epics, Purāṇas, Smṛtis and other technical writings. The poetry of the ancient penance-groves is much more elegant, appealing, impressive, expressive, and pervasive than that of the medieval court poets. The ornate, Pāṇini-abiding poetry is much inferior to the simple, natural, racy Purāṇic poetry in spite of its apparently aberrant forms, as an *udyāna-latā* is to a *vana-latā*. By the side of Vyāsa and Vālmīki and many other unnamed, forgotten Purāṇic poets, the later kāvya poets glow dim with all their avowed verbal skill. Few people read the kāvyas except for an examination purpose. But the readers and listeners of the Gitā, Caṇḍī, Bhāgavata etc. are available everywhere and throughout life. Passages from these works are memorised and reproduced frequently. On occasions, selected portions of these texts are read out. In this way, the language of the Purāṇas has been associated with the life of the Indian people. The kāvya language has little place in life outside the class-room.

Importance of Epic-Purāṇic language and literature

[1] T. Burrow calls Epic Sanskrit "less correct". (Vide his *Sanskrit Language*, p. 294, para 2).

It is therefore improper to call the Purāṇic language incorrect and the Kāvya language alone correct. The Purāṇic language is the language of the people, lively and practical. It also has its grammar, but that does not bind one like the octopus, or take away one's freedom of speech as a military regime.

Epic-Purāṇic language not devoid of grammar

About the two types of language M. Monier Williams writes as follows :

"We have two distinct phases of literature, the one simple and natural, that is to say, composed independently of grammatical rules, though of course amenable to them ; the other elaborate, artificial, and professedly written to exemplify the theory of grammar. The literary compositions which preceded the appearance of Panini's aphorisms belong of course to the first of these phases. Such are the Vedas, the code of Manu, and the two epic poems... The simplicity of the style in the code of Manu and the two epic poems is a plain indication that a grammar founded on, and intended to be a guide to, the literature, as it then existed, would have differed from the Pāṇini sūtras as a straight road from a labyrinth."[1]

Epic grammar–a straight road ; Pāṇini's grammar–a labyrinth

This simple, natural, Purāṇa language with all its so-called peculiarities is the truest form of the Sanskrit language, and in it is couched the major portion of the Sanskrit literature. The peculiarities are, therefore, no peculiarities at all. These are to be accepted as time-honoured usages. If the Pāṇinian system did not note these usages, that is not the fault of the Purāṇas.

Major portion of Sanskrit literature in Epic language

T. Burrow has said that 'Epic Sanskrit is a later form of Sanskrit than that of Pāṇini.'[2] If this is true, then how is it that the Pāṇinian law is not always obeyed there ? Hence it is to be admitted that the great writers of the Epics did not accept Pāṇini's rules as undisputed. This also proves the solidity of the Purāṇic language.

Epic writers have thrown the gauntlet to Pāṇini

In the collection of data for the present work, therefore, the Purāṇic language has also been consulted wherever necessary, besides the other stages of Sanskrit[3] as well as other Indo-European languages.

Data collected from Epic-Purāṇic literature withal

---

[1] Vide the Preface to his *Practical Sanskrit Grammar*, p. xi.

[2] T. Burrow—*Sanskrit Language*, p. 52.

[3] In his *Sanskrit Grammar*, Whitney has adopted a similar method

[*Contd.*]

3. METHOD OF APPROACH

Our touchstone to Pāṇini's rules-reasoning, literature & comparative philology

Everywhere in the following pages the three-fold method has been employed in establishing a point—(i) independent reasoning, (ii) reference to the literature (Sanskrit) in all its stages, and (iii) availing whatever light is thrown by comparative philology on each question. When it has not been possible to employ all for want of necessary materials in each, one or two of the methods have been employed.

Realistic approach—no belief without proof

Again, the approach purports to be realistic. Nothing has been taken for granted without adequate reason. Consquently, it has not been possible to uphold many of the traditional beliefs, such as 'all *padas* have *sup* or *tiṅ*', a 'taddhita suffix causes *vṛddhi*', and so on.[1] Such theories have not so far been challenged.

4. PĀṆINI AND PĀṆINIAN INTERPRETATION

Meaning of Pāṇini & Pāṇinian

The word 'Pāṇini' has generally been used in this book in the sense of the grammatical system initiated by Pāṇini, author of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Sometimes it has been used also as the personal name. The sense is clear in every case.

By 'Pāṇinian' is to be understood 'relating to Pāṇini' in the first sense, i.e., relating to the Pāṇinian system or school. 'Pāṇinian interpretation' is therefore = the interpretation offered by the three sages (Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali) or by the Pāṇinian school. Where a sūtra of the Aṣṭādhyāyī is not contradicted by any of the other sages, this becomes their common view. Where it is contradicted by them, their revision is recognised as the Pāṇinian interpretation in that case. Thus sometimes the view of the Sūtrakāra, sometimes, the view of the Vārtikakāra and sometimes the view of the Bhāṣyakāra come to be recognised as the Pāṇinian view or interpretation. In some cases the views of later commentators of the School also, where they have said something new, are to be regarded as Pāṇinian.

[*Contd. from previous page*]

by showing usages at all stages of the language including Epics and Purāṇas. The object of his grammar, he says, is—'to make a presentation of the facts of the language primarily as they show themselves in use in literature, and only secondarily as they are laid down by the native grammarians.' (Vide the Preface to his Grammar).

[1] For details please see the relevant Chapters.

Therefore the present work is not necessarily a criticism of the sūtras of Pāṇini alone, but of the entire system consisting of the sūtras, vārtikas and the Mahābhāṣya, as well as the commentaries and sub-commentaries thereon by the neo-grammarians, Kaiyaṭa, Nāgeśa, Dīkṣita and others.

5. DEPARTURES FROM THE TRADITIONAL VIEWS

The conclusions arrived at in the following dissertation are sometimes widely divergent from those traditionally held. This may be a big jolt to the orthodox way of thinking. For example, the theory *sup-tiṅ-antaṁ padam* has here been found not fully acceptable. For it has been shown here that a *pada* is possible without *sup* or *tiṅ*. This is unthinkable to the orthodox Sanskritist, and also against the modern philologists who believe Sanskrit is cent per cent an inflectional language. But no view has been held or rejected without assigning a reason.

Big departures from traditional views

Thus there may be occasional big departures from the traditional views, but there is never a departure from reason in what has been said in the following pages.

No departure from reason

PĀṆINIAN INTERPRETATION OF THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE

BORROWED VOCABULARY

SILENCE OF PĀṆINI

RECOGNITION BY KUMĀRILA BHAṬṬA

RECOGNITION BY MODERN PHILOLOGISTS

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF BORROWED WORDS

SOURCES OF BORROWING

CONCLUSION

[I] **BORROWED VOCABULARY**

1. SILENCE OF PĀṆINI

Sanskrit vocabulary contains a large number of words borrowed from various sources, usually non-Aryan. But this fact is not recorded anywhere in Pāṇini, though it has been said that one of the objects of grammar is to discriminate between right and wrong words, and enable one to avoid the *Mleccha* way of speech[1]; nay, the science of grammar is called *Śabdānuśāsana*[2] (rules relating to right words). Borrowed words are not Sanskrit words, and may be classed as wrong words or *apa-śabda*[3]. *Mleccha* or non- Indian words they definitely are in a good number of cases. Therefore a word or two about them was expected in the grammar of the Sanskrit language. Otherwise how could such words be avoided or even known by people ? But the three *Muni* s have kept silent on the matter.

2. RECOGNITION BY KUMĀRILA BHAṬṬA

It is probably Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, the noted Mīmāṁsaka, who first grew suspicious of such (= borrowed) words in Sanskrit, for he speaks of "Sanskrit words of which the meanings are not known to the people of Aryāvarta but known to the Mleccha," and so on[4].

---

[1] Vide Mbhāṣ. I : *duṣṭān śabdān mā pra-yukṣmahi iti adhyeyaṁ vyākaraṇam ; mlecchā mā bhūma iti adhyeyaṁ vyākaraṇam.*

[2] Patañjali begins his work saying—*atha śabdānuśāsanam*—on which Kaiyaṭa says—*vyākaraṇasya cedam anvarthaṁ nāma śabdānuśāsanam iti.*

[3] Patañjali has called Pkt. *goṇī* (cow) an *apa-śabda* in Sanskrit.

[4] Tantrav. under 1.3.9. :

Ye śabdā na prasiddhāḥ syur
āryāvarta-nivāsinām,
teṣāṃ mleccha-prasiddho'rtho
grāhyo neti vi-cintyate.
...āryāś ca mleccha-bhāṣābhyaḥ
kalpayantaḥ svakaṁ padam,
padāntarākṣaropetaṁ
kalpayanti kadācana,
nyūnākṣaraṁ kadācic ca
prakṣipantyadhikākṣaram.

As example of borrowed vocabulary Kumārila has mentioned *pika*, *nema*, *patrorṇa* and *vāravāṇa*.

Kumārila also speaks of bilingual Aryans (*dvailbhāṣika ārya*), i.e. Aryans speaking Sanskrit and *Mleceha* languages. If some Aryans spoke *Mleccha* languages also, it is easily believable that some *Mleccha* words entered Sanskrit through these speakers.

Also vide Rev. F. Kittel's introduction to his *Kannada—English Dictionary*.

3. RECOGNITION BY MODERN PHILOLOGISTS

The existence of extraneous words in Sanskrit has been recognised by some modern philologists too, such as Rev. F. Kittel, Dr. R. Caldwell, Dr. A. C. Burnell, Dr. Gundert, and Prof. T. Burrow. Says Prof. Burrow—

> "The basic vocabulary of Sanskrit is Indo-European..... but in addition there exist a large number of words which are without Indo-European etymology.....The total of such extraneous words is very large[1]."

Thus borrowed vocabulary in Sanskrit is a fact. A glance at the words listed in the appendix will make it clear.

4. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF BORROWED WORDS

The appearance of these words is enough to set anyone a-thinking as to whether they are genuine Sanskrit words. That these (and probably many more) words are not Sanskrit but of exotic origin will be evident also from the following considerations:

(i) Yāska, Śākaṭāyana and Pāṇini have held that nouns are derived from verbal roots. But not all nouns are so derivable. From this it can be said that the nouns not derivable from roots are not genuine Sanskrit. Such are *gaḍula*[2], *kahoḍa*[3] etc. Some such words are derived by grammarians from roots, but the derivations are clearly unsatisfactory; e.g., *kamaṭha* (tortoise) (fr. *kam-*[4], to desire), *mahilā* (fr. *mah-*[5], be great etc.), *karīra* (fr. *kṛ-*[6]), *vihā*, 'heaven' (fr. *hā-*[7], to give up). For in such cases the radical meaning and the current meaning of the word remain widely divergent. Some words are derived by grammarians from fictitious roots; e.g. *biḍāla* (fr. *bidi-*[8]), *kulāla* (fr. *kuli-*[9]) etc.

All such words are actually underivable from roots, and on the principle of verbal origin of nouns may be regarded as of extraneous origin.

---

[1] T. Burrow—*Sanskrit Language*, pp. 374-375.

[2] Vide Gaṇ.: *Kaḍārādi*, 2.2.38; *Gaurādi*, 4.1.41; *Brāhmaṇādi*, 5.1.124; also *Sidhmādi*, 5.2.97 (according to SED). The word is mentioned also in a Vedic text, Ṣaḍ-Br. 4.4.

[3] Vide Gaṇ.: *Śivādi*, 4.1.112; The word appears also in ŚBr. and MBh. (Vide SED).

[4] Vide Uṇ. 1.100: *kamer aṭhaḥ*.

[5] ibid. 1.55: *sali-kali-ani-mahi...ilac*.

[6] ibid. 4.29: *kṛ-śṛ-pṛ...īran*.

[7] ibid. 4.35: *viṣā-vihā*.

[8-9] ibid. 1.117: *tami-viśi-biḍi-mṛṇi-kuli.....kālan*; *kulāla* occurs also in Pāṇ. 4.3.118 (and the Gaṇ. on it).

(ii) Many of the words are absent from the earliest literature. Such are: *akaḍama*[1], *akkā*,[2] *attā*[3], *ābutta*[3], *iñcāka*[1], *iḍikka*[1], etc. This shows that they are later acquisitions from outside.

(iii) Many words are very rarely used or never used at all; e.g. *allā*[2] *akkā*, *attā*, *kaḍārā*[4] (rarely used); *ālīgu*[5], *vaṭāku*[6]., *culla*[7], *pilla*[7] etc. (never used). This is an indication that they had a difference from the other words. It may be their foreign origin.

(iv) A number of words are only synonyms to other Sanskrit words of Indo-European origin; e.g., *ghoṭa*, *ghoṭaka*, 'horse' (IE. Sanskrit *aśva*, cf. L. *equus*, Gk. *hippos* etc.); *unduru*, 'mouse' (IE. Skt. *mūṣ*, cf. Gk. *mus*, L. *mus*, Slav. *mysi*, Gmc. *mūs*, *Maus*, Eng. *mouse*). These words have no IE. etymology. These may be regarded as later additions from extraneous sources.

(v) Many words have a queer look which is a clear mark of their extra-Sanskrit origin. Such are: *kahoḍa*[8], *kohaḍa*[8], *gaḍera*[9], *guhalu*[10], *bhaḍila*[11] etc. These have not the appearance of Sanskrit words. They may fit well in the Dravidian vocabulary. Under this head may also be treated words like *titau*[12], 'sieve,' with a hiatus which is against Sanskrit phonology.

(vi) Unusual suffixes have been assumed to account for some words; e.g. *pilu-kuṇa* where a suffix *-kuṇa*[13] is assumed; *kaṭhera*[9], *kuṭhera*[9] (with

---

[1] Mentioned in SED.

[2] Referred to by Pāṇini in 7.3.107 (*ambārtha-nadyor hrasvaḥ*). Vide Kāśikā etc.

[3] Rarely found in Kāvya literature.

[4] Pāṇ. 2.2.38: *Kaḍārāḥ karmadhāraye.*

[5] Gaṇ. (*Gargādi*, 4.1.105).

[6] ibid. (*Bāhvādi*, 4.1.96).

[7] Vide Vārt. (on Pāṇ. 5.2.33): *klinnasya cil pil laśca.....*; *culādeśo vaktavyaḥ.*

[8] Vide Gaṇ. (*Śivādi*, 4.1.112); also vide supra.

[9] Uṇ. 1.59: *kaṭhi-kuṭhi-gaḍi-daṁśibhya erak.*

[10] Gaṇ.: *Gargādi*, 4.1.105.

[11] ibid.: *Yaskādi*, 2.4.63.

[12] The real Sanskrit word for 'sieve: is *cālanī* (fr. *cal-*, to move) which is current in various forms in Modern Indo-Aryan. *tita-u* has always been rare in use. This is another proof of its non-Sanskrit origin.

[12] Pāṇ. 5.2.24: *tasya pākamūle kuṅap-jāhacau.*

a supposed suffix *-era*). Neither can such suffixes be taken to be Sanskrit, nor the words.

(vii) Some of the words are very unsatisfactorily explained, if regarded as Sanskrit but satisfactorily explained when regarded as foreign. Therefore these are to be treated as foreign words. Such are: *mahilā, allā, Turāsāh, arvan* etc. These words are traditionally derived from *mah-, lā-, sah-*, and *arv-*, but this is hardly satisfactory. More satisfactory becomes the etymology when *mahilā* is derived from Ar. *mahal*, 'house', so that *mahilā* literally means 'home-dwelling'; *allā* derived from Ar. *Āllā*, 'God'; *Turāsāh* regarded as coming from a lost Iranian *Turān-Śāh*, 'ruler of Turan', cf. the modern *Shah of Iran*; and *arvan* as derived from Ar. *Ārab*, 'Arabia', so that *arvan*= literally 'Arabian', i.e., an 'Arabian horse'.

(viii) The statement of Patañjali that one should study grammar to be able to avoid the *Mleccha* forms of speech is an indication that some *Mleccha* or non-Indian words had come to be used in the Sanskrit language.

(ix) Indian people had established various relations with the peoples of Greece, Egypt, Arabia, and Indonesia at a very remote period of history. This contact certainly resulted in borrowing words by either side. *Horā, dīnāra, phā,*[1] 'light' etc. are clear instances of brorrowing by Sanskrit from Greek. *Phā* is obviously from Gk. *phos* (=Skt. *bhās*).

(x) The Indian Aryans were constantly at war with the *Asuras* or various non-Aryan tribes. The Aryans certainly acquired a munber of *Asura* words in course of these protracted hostilities.

(xi) The ancient universities of Taxila and Nalanda drew learners from distant quarters of the globe. The Indians could not fail to acquire some words from these foreigners.

(xii) There is hardly a language on earth which has not some foreign words in it. Therefore Sanskrit too may be said to have some such words. Sanskrit has a history of at least three thousand years (1500 B.C.—1500 A.D.). During this period the Indians have come in contact with numerous races of the world. This makes the above assumption all the more strengthened.

(xiii) Cerebral or lingual consonants (*ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh, ṇ*) being of non-IE. origin, the words with any of these sounds without palpable reason may

---

[1] Vide SED.

be regarded as borrowed from sources where lingual consonants were original[1].

In view of all these the existence of extra-Sanskrit—Aryan and non-Aryan—words in Sanskrit may be taken to be a fact, and the words in the appended list will be found exotic by one or more of the above considerations.

5. SOURCES OF BORROWING

These extraneous words are found to be of Dravidian, Austric, Scythian, Iranian, Semitic, Greek and Prākṛt origin. Some cases may be examined here :

(i) *akkā*[2]—The word meaning 'mother' is hardly used in the existing [Sanskrit] literature. But it is widespread in the Scythian family ; cf. Lapp. *akke* (wife, grandmother), Tung. *oki*, *okin* (elder sister), Mg. *achan* (id.), Tib. *achche* (id.), Turk. dial. *ege* (id.), Morv. *aky* (id.), Ugr. *iggen* (id.) ; also Mongol *aka* (elder brother), Tung. *aki* (id.), Uig. *acha* (id.), Ost. *iki* (old man), Finn. *ukko* (id.), Hung. *agg* (id.).[3]

Scythian origin of the word is therefore clear.

(ii) *alābu*—Though the word occurs in the Veda, yet a Sanskrit derivation seems impossible. Neither is the word frequent in use. On the contrary there are : Malayan *labu*, *labo*, Khmer *lbow*, Batak *labu*[4]. Beng. *lāu* and Hindi *lāukī* are strikingly similar to these forms in not having the initial *a* seen in the Sanskrit word. Therefore the word may be regarded as Austric.

(iii) *ārabhaṭa*—rarely used in Sanskrit, but cf. Dravidian : Kan. *ārbaṭa* (roaring), Tu. *ārbaṭā* (uproar), Tam. *ārbhaṭamu* (id.)[5]. The word may therefore be regarded as Dravidian.

---

[1] Also vide Whitney—*Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 17, para 46 : "The linguals are.....in part occurring in words that have no traceable Indo-European connection, and are perhaps derived from the aboriginal languages of India".

"They (i.e. the linguals) are either products of abnormal corruption, or signs of the non-Indo-European character of the words in which they appear".

[2] Referred to in Pāṇ. 7.3.107. (*ambārtha-nadyorhrasvaḥ*). Vide Kāś.

[3] Vide Caldwell—*Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages*, p. 612.

[4] T. Burrow—*Sanskrit Language*, p. 378.

[5] ibid.

(iv) *jālma*—The word is rarely used and underivable in Sanskrit. Obviously this is from Ar. *jālim* (rogue, wicked).

In this way a sizeable number of words can be shown to be of foreign origin[1]. Most of the difficult words of the Veda, which are very unsatisfactorily understood or not understood at all, are, in all probability, imported from foreign sources. Viewing them in that light would probably herald a new epoch in Vedic exegesis.

6. CONCLUSION

Without recognising these vast exotic elements in the Sanskrit language the Paninian grammar has concluded. The interpretation of the language as contained therein, therefore, involves non-observation of a major issue. It cannot be said that such words did not exist when the grammar was in the making. For borrowed words are noted from Veda[2] downwards, and also Patañjali has a casual reference to the *Mleccha* way of speech[3], which, among other things, may point to the existence of *Mleccha* words in the speech of the Sanskrit-speakers.

---

[1] Kittel, Caldwell and Burrow have already done some good work in this regard, and hence it is needless to proceed further in the matter here.

[2] e.g. *ulūkhala*, *alasa*, *paṇḍita*, *śava* etc. Vide T. Burrow—*Sans. Lang.* p. 386: "Concerning the date when these words were taken into Sanskrit, it may be observed that the majority are post-Vedic. On the other hand, it is important to note that there is a small nucleus already found in the Ṛgveda. The number added in the later Saṁhitās and in the Brāhmaṇas remains comparatively restricted".

Vedic occurrences of: *ulūkhala*—RV. 1.28.6; MS. 2.7.16; TS. 1.6.8.3.; Śaun.-S. 11.3.3.; 12.3.13; Paipp-S. 12.3.12, 13; ŚBr. 1.1.4.6-7; etc.

alasa—Ait-Br. 6.33.

paṇḍita—ŚBr. 14.6.4.1; 14.9.4.16-17.

śava—ŚBr. 13.8.1.1.; 1.8.3.18; Paipp-S. 19.5.9; Śaun-S. 20, 131.4.

[3] *mlecchā mā bhūma iti adhyeyaṁ vyākaraṇam*. Mbhāṣ. I.

UNORIGINAL SIBILANTS : ALTERNATION BEEWEEN Ś, S

ALTERNATION NOT NOTED BY PĀṆINI

ORIGINALITY OF SPELLINGS (WITH *Ś*, *S*) EXAMINED

UNORIGINALITY KNOWN FROM COGNATE FORMS ALONE

REASON BEHIND OPTIONAL USE OF *Ś*, *S*

CONCLUSION

[II] UNORIGINAL SIBILANTS : ALTERNATION BETWEEN Ś, S

7. ALTERNATION NOT NOTED BY PĀṆINI

It has not been noted in Paninian grammar that in a large number of cases palatal and dental sibilants (*ś* and *s*) are interchanged, or alternate with each other though not both are original.[1] Some such cases are :

	Spelling with *ś*	Spelling with *s*
1.	*aśru*	*asru, asra*
2.	*kalaśa*	*kalasa*
3.	*kaśipu*	*kasipu*
4.	*kaśmala*	*kasmala*
5.	*kiśalaya*	*kisalaya*
6.	*keśara*	*kesara*
7.	*dāśa*	*dāsa*
8.	*raśanā*	*rasanā*
9.	*Vaśiṣṭha*	*Vasiṣṭha*
10.	*Śambhala*	*Sambhala*
11.	*Śarva*	*Sarva*
12.	*śasya*	*sasya*
13.	*śāyaka*	*sāyaka*
14.	*śāraṅga*	*sāraṅga*
15.	*Śiprā*	*Siprā*
16.	*śīkara*	*sīkara*
17.	*śīdhu*	*sīdhu*
18.	*śūkara*	*sūkara*
19.	*śṛgāla*	*sṛgāla*
20.	*śyāla*	*syāla*

It will be seen that in such cases from one original spelling the other spelling has developed. The later spelling is therefore unoriginal and may be called incorrect. The correct and incorrect spellings should have been pointed out in grammar. This however, has not been done, with the result that both spellings have come to stay in the language. People adopt any spelling according to personal liking, or any spelling at any time. This is definitely a chaos in spelling. In no other language this exists. Spelling is fixed everywhere. In Sanskrit this looks rather inconsistent seeing that it claims to be the most regulated language.

---

[1] By 'original' is here meant 'original in Sanskrit:, not in Indo-European.

Further, Patañjali has said that grammar is to be studied to be able to avoid incorrect words. But nothing has been done in grammar to enable one to avoid the incorrect spellings in the above cases.

It cannot be said that double spelling (with *ś*, *s*) may not have been there during the period when Paninian system was evolved, so that the three sages (*tri-muni*) are not to blame if they have said nothing about it. For the phenomenon appears right from the Veda and continues through the Epics and the *Purāṇas*, as will be evident from the following discussions.

8. ORIGINALITY OF SPELLINGS (WITH *Ś*, *S*) EXAMINED

Now it is necessary to show that of the two spellings one is original and the other unoriginal and hence incorrect. For the purpose the following cases may be noted:

(1) *aśru ; asra, asru*

A. *aśru* is far more frequent in use, and also it has the earlier date than the dental spellings. It occurs in about thirty Vedic texts.[1]

In post-Vedic literature it occurs in almost all texts whenever there is an occasion for tears.[2]

---

[1] Occurrences of *aśru* in Veda: RV. 10.95.12-13; Kāṭh-S. 34.12; 53.10; Kāṇ-S. 27.9.1; TS. 1.5.1. 1-2; 5.7.20.1; MS. 2.7.10; 3.15.8; VS. 25.9; Śaun-S. 5.19.13; 11.11.7;

Ait-Br. 7.8; Gop-Br. 2.1.15; Jai up-Br. 3.2.3.1; ŚBr. 4.2.1.11; 6.1.1.11; 6.1.2.2-4; 6.3.1.28; 9.1.1.6; 12.7.1.2; K-r-Up. 2; K-ś-Up. 2.2; Kuṇḍ-Up.4; Rudr-Up. 1.3; Rudrākṣa-Up. 5;

A-Pariś. 7.11.29; A-Prāy. 5.4; Āgni-Gṛ. 3.4.1.18; Āpa-Śr. 9.4. 16-17; 10.14.1.; Āśv-Śr. 3.12.15; Baudh-Gr. 1.6.26; 4.1.11; Baudh-Pi. 3.2.9; Baudh-Śr. 13.43.17; 28.1.17; Bhār-Śr. 9.6.12; Vi-Dh. 22.61; 79.20; Vaikh-Śr. 21.2.4; Śāṅkh-Śr. 3.4.12; Suparṇ. 7.3.4; Hir-Śr. 15.1,85.

[2] Some examples are:

MBh., Nārī., 9.7: *aśru-kaṇṭhīḥ samāropya tatas tā niryayau purāt*;

ibid. 10.2: *aśru-kaṇṭhā vi-ni-śvasya rudanta idam a-bruvan*;

R. 2.48.3: *aśrūṇi mumucuḥ sarve vāṣpeṇa pihitānanāḥ*;

Pratimā. 3.3: *kledayantīva mām aśrubhir mātaraḥ*;

Ragh. 3.61: *papāta bhūmau saha sainikāśrubhiḥ*;

Megh. 106: *muktā-sthūlās tarukiśalayeṣvaśru-leśāḥ patanti*;

Vikr. 4.66: *dhautādharevāśrubhiḥ*;

Śak. 6.27: *dhautāśru-sekam udakaṁ pitaraḥ pivanti*;

Naiṣ. 1.144: *ānandāśrubhir anusriyamāṇa-mārgān*;

Also Uṇ. 5.21.

The spelling *aśra* is also noticed in Megh. 104:

aśrais tāvan muhur upacitair dṛṣṭir ālupyate me.

B. *asra*—In the Veda it occurs in only three late texts,[1] and in post-Vedic literature in the MBh. and several Kāvyas, grammatical and medical texts.[2]

The spelling *asru* rarely occurs :

śrutvā śrutvā 'sru-dhārāṁ tyajati....

—Quoted in ŚKD.

Thus judged by the frequency of use and early appearance in literature the spelling with the palatal ś (*aśru*) comes to be the original one. This is substantiated also by comparative philology, for there are the forms : Gk. *dakru*, L. *lacryma*, Goth. *tagrs*, AS. *teagor*—all meaning 'tear'. Now Greek *k*, Latin *c* and Teutonic (Goth., A.S.) *g* require that in the Sanskrit cognate there should be a *k* or a *k*- representative (*ś*, *c*). Hence *aśru* (<**daśru*<**dakru*) with *ś* alone can be the cognate, not *asra* or *asru*, which must be regarded as a post- IE. and late Vedic development.

(2) *kalaśa, kalasa*

Here too the palatal spelling claims originality by reason of its far greater frequency in use, earlier appearance in literature, and the evidence of comparative philology, which are shown below :

A. *kalaśa*—Over forty Vedic texts contain, many of them frequently, this spelling (with patalal *ś*).[3]

---

[1] Paipp-S. 2.85.1 ; Jai-Br. 100 ; TBr. 2.7.13.2.

[2] Some examples are :

teṣām adya kariṣyāmi tavāsreṇodaka-kriyām.—MBh. 3.157.49, according to Apte's Dictionary.

nāgendrā yavasābhimukhāḥ sāsrekṣaṇā vājinaḥ—Pratimā 2.2

na vedmi sa prārthita-durlabhaḥ sakhibhir asrottaram ikṣitām imām—Kumār. 5.61

kṣīṇe' sre madhurākāṅkṣā—Bh-Pr. quoted in ŚKD,

kuryāt sāsraṁ śirāharṣaṁ
tenakṣyudvīkṣaṇākṣamam—Quoted in ŚKD.

In grammatical literature it occurs in—Uṇ. 2.13 and Gaṇ. (*Sukhādi* and *Naḍādi gaṇas* referred to in Pāṇ. 3.1.18 ; 4.1.99 ; 5.1.131 ; 6.2.170-171 : *sukhādibhyaḥ kartṛ-vedanāyām, naḍādibhyaḥ phak* etc.)

[3] RV. 1.117.12 ; 3.32.15 ; 4.27.5 ; 6.47.6 ; 9.8.6 ; 10.167.1 ; etc. (in all fifty times) ; Kapiṣṭh. 48.14 ; Kāṭh-S. 34.4 ; 35.16 ; Kāṇ-S 9.6.1 ; Kauth-S. 1.489, 535, 537, 557, 559, 571 ; 2.52, 131, 237, 292, 382, 502, 533, 550, 676, 769 ; Jai-S. 1.51.3 ; 1.55.3, 5 ; 1.57.4, 6 ; 1.58. 6 ; 3.5.11 ; 3.16.9 ; 3.21.2 ; 3.24.8 ; 3.31.2 ; 3.39.1 ; 3.41.9 ; 3.43.6 ; TS. 3.2.4.1 ; 6.5.7.2 ;

[*Contd.*

In later literature too the word is often met with from the MBh. onwards.[1]

B. kalasa—The notable thing with regard to this spelling is that it is totally absent from the Veda. It occurs only in several passages of the later literature.[2]

(*Contd. from previous page*)

6.5.10, 1, 2 ; 7.1.6.6 ; 7.5.5.2 ; Paipp-S. 3.20. 6 ; 16.24.6 ; 20.31.7 ; 16.25.4 ; 46.32.7 ; 19.30.9 ; VS. 8.42 ; MS. 4.5.9 ; 4.8.7 ; Śaun-S. 3.12.7 ; 7.81.2 ; 9.1.6 ; 9.4.6, 15 ; 18.4.30, 58, 60 ; 20.8.3 ;

Ait-Br. 6.11 ; Gop-Br. 2.2.21 ; Tāṇḍ. 9.6.1, 2, 4, 5,8; 9.9.1. TBr. 3.7.4.16 ; ŚBr. 4.5.8.6 ; 4.5.10.7 ;

Cakr-Up. 4 ; Piṅg-Up. 3.9 ; Yoga-k-Up. 3.25 ; Vajras-Up. 5 ; Śiv-up. 6.56 ;

Āgni-Gṛ. 2.4.1, 16 ; Āśv-Gṛ. 2.8.16 ; Kāṭh-Gṛ. 11.2 ; Kauṣ-Gṛ. 3.2.6 ; Gobh-Gṛ. 2.1.12. (Vide VPK. In Bakshi's edn. 2.1.13) ; Pār-Gṛ. 3.4.4. ; Bhār-Gṛ. 2.3.9 (śī) ; Mān-Gṛ. 2.11.12 ; Vaikh-Gṛ. 4.10.18 . Śāṅkh-Gṛ. 3.2.9 ; Hir-Gṛ. 1.27.4 ; Āpa-Śṛ. 12.29.9 ; 14.27.3 ; Āśv-Śr. 2.12.4 ; 5.5.19 ; 5. 12.15 ; Kāty-Śr. 8.9.18 ; 25.12.23 ; Mān-Śr. 2.3.7.6 ; Vaikh-Śr. 21.4, 6 ; Śāṅkh-Śr. 7.15.8 ; 13.12.1 ; 17.4.8 ; 17.17.9 ; Baudh-Dh. 1.5.126 (Vide VPK. In Hultzsch's edition the number is 1.5.11.41 which does not tally with the VPK number. There is no other occurrence of the word in this text i.e. Baudh-Dh. In M. More's edn. the location is 1.5.147. The passage runs as follows :

suvarṇa-rajatābhyāṁ vā
gavāṁ śṛṅgodakena vā.
navaiś ca kalaśaiḥ snātvā
sadya eva viśudhyati.)

Vaikh-Dh. 1.8.1 (*kālaśika*) ; A-Pariś. 5.1.2 ; 21.2.1 ; Āpa-M. 2.35.4.

1 Vide MBh. 1.18.32 ; 6.4.174 ; Bhāg. 8.8.14 ; Tantras. : '*kalaśānāṁ pramāṇaṁ tu mukham aṣṭāṅgulaṁ smṛtam* (quoted in ŚKD.); Svap. 1.8 ; *kasyārthaḥ kalaśena* etc. ; Nais. 11.8 (Here the spelling *kalaśi* is used : *kalaśim udadhi-gurvīṁ ballabhā loḍayanti*) ; Kathās. 21.7 ; also Śak., Vikr., Pañcat. and Hit. (Vide SW.).

In Linguistic literature it occurs in—Nir. 11.12 ; Uṇ. 2.3.142 ; Pāṇ. 4.3.56 ; Gaṇ. 2.4.68 ; 5.4.139.

2 Some examples are : *stana-kalasa-kabara-bhāra-raśanā*.....Bhāg. 5.2.6. Vide SW. But the palatal spelling also is noticed in some editions ; *navaiva kalasāḥ proktā*.....Kāl-P. Ch. 87 ; *iti kalasam ā-varjayati*, Śak. Act. 1.

The feminine form is used in the *Naiś.* 2.8:

avalambita-karṇa-śaṣkulī-
kalasīkaṁ racayann avocata.

So much for the occurrences. Obviously the palatal spelling is the original one. The corresponding forms in Greek and Latin corroborate this: cf. Gk. *kalyx*, L. *calyx, calix.*[1] The k-element in these forms shows that Skt. *kalaśa* (not *kalasa*) is to be connected. Thus *kalaśa* comes to be Indo-European, but not *kalasa* which must be a subsequent development.

(3) *keśara, kesara*

Of this pair the dental spelling has the earlier date, for it is found in a number of Vedic texts,[2] while the other spelling is totally absent from that literature. In post-Vedic literature both spellings are equally met with. Again ,comparative philology provides evidence for the antiquity of the dental spelling, for there is a kindred form in Latin to *kesara*, but not to *keśara*: cf. L. caesarius. Therefore this spelling can be regarded as the original one. The earliest occurrence of the palatal spelling is in the MBh.[3]

(4) *dāśa, dāsa*

Both spellings are found in the Veda and later. But it is the dental spelling which has greater frequency.[4] Besides, the palatal spelling

---

[1] For the connection vide SED and Orig.

[2] Kāṭh-S. 38.3; Kāṇ-S. 21.6.12; Paipp-S. 9.18.6; MS. 2.6.5.; 3.11.9; VS. 19.91; Śaun-S. 5.18.11; Jai-Br. 150; TBr. 2.6.4.5; ŚBr. 6.2.2.15; Nār-P-Up. 6.3; Rām-tāp. 2.45, 46, 48; Rām-rah. 228.18; 233.20; 244.11; Haṁs-Up. 8; A-Prā. 3.1.7; Āpa-Śr. 18.10.21; Kāty-Śr. 20.5.16; Hir-Śr. 13.4.10; Śaun-Cat. 4.96.

[3] Vide MBh. 1.125.3: *palāśais tilakaiś cūtaiś campakaiḥ pārimadrakaiḥ, karṇikārair aśokaiś ca keśarair atimuktakaiḥ.*

[4] Occurrences of *dāsa*—RV. 1.32.11; 1.92.8; 1.104.2; 2.11.2; 2.12.4; 2.13.8; 2.20.6; 3.12.6; 3.34.1; 4.18.9; 4.30.14, 15, 21; 5.30.5, 7-9; 5.34.6; 6.20.6; 6.22.10; 6.26.5; 6.33.3; 6.47.21; 6.60.6; 7.19.2; 7.83.1; 7.86.7; 7.99.4; 8.24.27; 8.32.2; 8.40.6; 8.46.32; 8.51.9; 8.56.3; 8.70.10; 8.96.18; 10.22.8; 10.23.2; 10.38.3; 10.49.6-7; 10.54.1; 10.62.10; 10.69.6; 10.73.7; 10.83.1; 10.86.19; 10.99.6; 10.102.3; 10.120.2; 10.138.3; RV.-Khila 1.2.21; 3.3.9.; 3.8.3; 3.15.9; 3.16.5; Kāṭh-S. 4.15; Kāṇ-S. 32.6.13; Kauth-S. 2.159, 205, 834, 926, 1054, Jai-S. 3.18.12; 4.5.6; 4.19.1; 4.22.9; TS. 1.1.14.1; Paipp-S.

does not occur in the RV.,[1] whereas the other spelling is found there about sixty times. These things clearly point to the originality of the dental spelling (*dāsa*).[2]

The originality of *dāsa* is indicated also by the following facts:

(i) Yāska has explained *dāsa*,[3] but not *dāśa*. If *dāśa* occurred in the RV or had the same importance with him, he would explain it too. Yāska's ignoring of the word certainly counts much.

(ii) *dāśa* has disappeared from later Sanskrit, where *dhīvara* is found instead. The great Kālidāsa has *dhīvara* in both Skt. and Pkt. passages,[4] but not *dāśa*. If the word *dāśa* had been

---

4.21.1; 4.32.1; 6.1.2; 6.14.5, 7; 8.1.3, 6; 8.3.7; 8.12.5; 13.6.11; 13.7.4; 19.37.1; 20.29.1; MS. 4.10.5; VS. 33.82; Śaun-S. 4.9.8; 4.32.1; 5.2.2; 5.11.3, 6; 7.15.1; 20.11.1; 20.34.4; 20.36.10; 20.37.2; 20.107.5; 20.126.19; Ait-Ār. 1.3.4; Ait-Br. 6.18-19; Gop-Br. 2.4.2; 2.6.1; Jai-Br. 62; Śāṅkh-Br. 21.4; 22.4; (In ŚBr. 14.7.2.30 the deriv. *dāsya* occurs); Kāl-Up. 4.2.5; Ch-Up. 7.24.2; Bhava-S-Up. 2.35, 42; Mah-Up. 3.35; Rāja-ś-Up. 425.17; Vanad-Up. 459.22; Śiv-Up. 7.110; Āgni-Gṛ 2.4.7, 17; Āpa-Gṛ. 23.7; Āpa-Dh. 2.9.11; 2.4.21 (2.2.4.20 in Buhler's edn.); Āpa-Śr. 21.18.7; 21.19.18; 21.20.5; Kauś. 17.15; 89.4; 90.18; Gaut-Dh. 20.4; (21.5 in More's edn.); Baudh-Śr. 15.1.15; 26.10.10; Drāhy. 5.4.13; Lāṭy. 2.8.13; 8.4.14; Vās-Dh. 15.12; Vi-Dh. 22.19, 57 (*dāsī*); 57.16; Vait-Śr. 31.25; Śāṅkh-Śr. 8.25.1; 18.14.5; Suparṇ. 9.5; 10.3; Hir-Dh. 2.1.126; Hir-Śr. 13.1.31; 16.6.39; Uṇ. 5.10; Gaṇ. 3.1.13; 4.1.41, 99; 4.2.54, 116; Nir. 2.17; Vārt. on Pāṇ. 4.1.35; etc.

Occurrences of *dāśa*—Kāṇ-S. 34.3.3; Kṣud. 3.10.16; Jai-Ārṣ-Br. 1.538; Tāṇḍ-Br. 13.5.26-27 (*dāśaspatya*); TBr. 3.4.12.1; Brah. 2.3.43; Lāṭy. 7.4.1, 16; VS. 30.16;

Uṇ. 5.11; Pāṇ. 3.4.73 ('*dāśa-goghnau sampradāne*');

Kathās. 26.168-170; Devībh. 2.1.39; Bhāg. 9.22.20; Mn. 8.409; MBh. 14.1395; R. 2.84.7, 16; etc.

[1] RV. 1.127.7 has the form *dāśā* which is interpreted by scholars as instr. sing. from *dāś* (<*dāś*, to give, + *-kvip*). Vide Sāy., Veṅkaṭ., and VPK. SW., however, finds *dāśa* here.

[2] The question of originality of both on the ground of difference in meaning need not arise, for both words are seen in both senses (servant, fisherman). For *dāsa* (fisherman) vide Mn. 10.32, 34, and for *dāśa* (servant)—*dāśa—dāśyate dīyate bhṛti-mūlyam asmai bhṛtyaḥ*. Ramānātha.

[3] *Nir.* 2.17 (on *dāsa-patnīr ahi-gopā* etc.)

[4] Vide *Śak.*

in vogue in Kālidāsa's time, the fisherman would not have said, "*hage kkhu śakkāvatālavāśī dhīvale,*" but would have used the simpler word (*dāśa*) instead. The later appearance and the subsequent disappearance of the word may be a pointer to its unoriginality.

(iii) The spelling *dāsa* has continued ever since its appearance in the RV.

(iv) The fish-dealing castes of Bengal use the surname *Dāsa* (not *Dāśa*) even to-day.

(v) In Vi-Dh.[1] there is the compound *dāsa-gopāla-nāpita,* and in Gaṇ. the compound *dāsa-grāma,* where *dāsa* is certainly a caste-name. Such early use of the word in the sense of the caste, coupled with the present day use noted above, shows that the other spelling (*dāśa*) was a temporary diversion from the original spelling (*dāsa*).

(vi) In Veda *dāsa* was the designation of a particular caste or community.[2] Therefore *dāśa* (fisherman) must be regarded as coming out of *dāsa.* The Vedic *Dāsa*s might have subsequently turned fishermen in many cases. With a new profession they were probably called by the new name *dāśa* formed out of the original name *dāsa.*

(vii) In VS.[3] and TBr.[4] the word *dāśa* has been used side by side with *kaivarta*[5] and *dhīvara*[6]. This shows that *dāśa* was not exactly the same caste as *dhīvara,* etc. Hence it may be said that *dāśa* was the new name given to the ancient *dāsa* caste.

(5) *Vaśiṣṭha, Vasiṣṭha*

Of these, the spelling with the dental *s* is seen from the RV. downwards. The other spelling is totally absent from the early literature (i.e.,

---

[1] Vi-Dh. 57.16 : *ārdhakaḥ kulamitraṁ ca dāsa-gopāla-nāpitāḥ, etc. śūdreṣu bhojyānnāḥ*.....

[2] cf. RV. 2.12 : *yo dāsaṁ varṇam adharaṁ guhā' kaḥ.*

[3] VS. 30.16.

[4] TBr. 3.4.12.1.

[5] Also spelt *kevarta.*

[6] Also written *dhaivara.*

Veda)[1]. Then again the dental spelling is so numerous in the Vedic use[2] that the question of originality must be decided in its favour. In later literature the palatal spelling has a slight edge over the other spelling, but that cannot turn the table. R., like the Veda, has the dental spelling alone ; MBh. and Mn. have both.

(6) *Śambhala, Sambhala*[3]

The spelling with the palatal ś is not found in the Veda, where only

---

[1] In a few passages of Tāṇḍ. the palatal spelling is given in some editions ; e.g. 7.7.18 in Chinnaswami's edn.

[2] Vasiṣṭha—RV. 1.112.9 ; 7.7.7 ; 7.12.3 ; 7.23.1, 6 ; 7.9.6 ; 7.18.4, 21 ; 7.22.3 ; 7.26.5 ; 7.33.1-14 ; 7.37.4 ; 7.39.7 ; 7.40.7 ; 7.42.6 ; 7.59.3 ; 7.62.3 ; 7.70.6 ; 7.73.3 ; 7.76.7 ; 7.77.6 ; 7.80.1 ; 7.86.5 ; 7.88.1, 4 ; 7.90.7 ; 7.91.7 ; 7.96.1, 3 ; 10.15.8 ; 10.65.15 ; 10.66.14-15 ; 10.122.8 ; 10.150.5 ; 10.181.1 ; Kapiṣṭh. 25.9 ; 31.11 ; Kāṭh-S. 8.16 ; 12.15 ; 16.19 ; 20.9 ; 32.2 ; 37.17 ; Kāṇ-S. 14.7.1 (14.7.2 acc. to VPK) ; 22.5.8 ; 39.6.1 ; Kauth-S. 1.241, 330 ; 2.279, 656 ; Jai-S. 1.3.4, 8 ; 1.25.9 ; 2.5.7 ; 3.23.10 ; 3.54.6 ; TS. 3.1.7.3 ; 3.5.2.1 ; 4.3.2.1 ; 5.2.10.5 ; 5.4.11.3 ; 7.4.7.1 ; Paipp-S. 2.28.4 ; 4.38.3 ; 5.28.4 ; 10.9.2 ; 11.5.13 ; 14.3.23 ; MS. 1.4.12 ; 2.7.19 ; 4.2.9 ; 4.12.4 ; 4.14.7 ; VS. 13.54 ; 19.51 ; 20.54 ; 39.8 ; Śaun-S. 4.29.3 ; 18.3.16 , 46 ; 20.12.1, 6 ; 20.117.3 ;

Ārṣ-Br. I.61, 72, 107 etc. (in all 37 times) ; Ait-Ār. 1.4.2 ; 1.5.2 ; 2.2.2-4 ; 3.1.6 ; 5.2.2 ; Ait-Br. 1.21, 28 ; 6.18, 20 ; 7.16, 34 ; 8.21 ; Tāṇḍ-Br. 4.7.3 ; 5.4.5 ; 8.2.3, 4 etc. (13 times) ; TĀr. 10.21.1 ; TBr. 1.3.10.9 ; 2.3.1.3 ; 2.4.3.1 ; 3.1.2.7 ; 3.5.2.3 ; 3.6.1.3 ; Gop-Br. 1.2.8 ; 2.2.10 (See VPK. Gaastra's edn. gives *Vāsiṣṭha*), 13 ; 2.3.9, 23 ; 2.4.2 ; 2.6.1 ; Jai-Ārṣ-Br. I.107, 241, 288, 313, 328 etc. (21 times) ; Jai-up-Br. 3.1.3.13 ; 3.4.1.2 ; 3.4.4.6-7 ; Jai-Br. 43, 129, 145, 171, 195 ; ŚBr. 2.4.4.2 ; 6.4.2.7 ; 8.1.1.6 ; 12.6.1.38, 41 ; 14.5.2.6 ; 14.9.2.2, 7, 14 ; 14.9.3.4 ; Śāṅkh-Ār. 2.16 ; 9.2, 8 ; Śāṅkh-Br. 4.8 ; 25.2 ; 26.14-15 ; 29.2 ; 30.3 ; Ṣaḍ-Br. 1.5 ; 3.7 ;

Akṣ-Up. 15 ; Ārṣ-Up. 9.3 ; Gāy-Up. sentence No. 5 ; Ch-Up. 5.1.2, 13 ; 5.2.5 ; Nār-Up. 6.8 ; Bṛh-Up. 6.1 ; Bṛh-Ār-Up. 2.2.4 ; 6.1.2, 7, 14 ; 6.3.2 ; Mah-Nār-Up. 2, 28 ; Mukt-Up. 1.1.2 (Vide VPK) ; Mṛty-Up. 2 ; Rām-tāp. 4.39 ; 5.7 ; Rām-rah. 2.41 ; 3.1 ; Vajras-Up. 5 ; Śar-Up. 19 ;

The word occurs also in 33 Sūtra works, e.g. Baudh-Dh. 2.5.27 (Vide VPK); Baudh-Śr. 10.35.6; 18.52.9 ; Śāṅkh-Śr. 14.25.1; Bhār-Gr. 3.10.1, 8 ; etc.

Also, Nir. 4.14 ; 6.30 ; 9.26 ; 11.20 ; Pāṇ. 2.4.65 ; Bṛh-Dev. etc.

[3] The pair is taken up here though not in general use for the fact that one of them has been famous as the name of the birth-place of *Kalki-Avatāra*.

the dental spelling appears[1]. In later literature both spellings are noticed, though the usual spelling there is with the palatal ś[2]. The dental spelling is noticed there in the VP.[3]

ORIGINAL SPELLING : From the fact that the dental spelling occurs in the Veda and later, and palatal spelling only later, the originality of the dental spelling may be admitted. There is, however, a difference of meaning in the Vedic and the later uses. In Veda it means 'bride-groom', 'husband', 'suitor', 'accoster'[4]; in later literature the sense is 'the village' of that name. But this difference is only apparent, for as the name of a village the word is a meaningless proper name, and any sense, if available elsewhere, can be read into it. Thus the difference vanishes. There is little room for doubt that the Vedic word is used as the name of the village, whatever the later spelling. And VP. has kept the Vedic spelling intact, as has already been noted.

Also there are the feminine forms, *śambhalī* and *sambhalī*, both meaning a 'procuress'. These are doubtless from *śambhala* and *sambhala*, which too must mean the same thing, 'suitor' etc. Now, both *śambhala* and *sambhala* having the same sense the earlier spelling (dental) must be regarded as original.

Some hold the opposite view without assigning a reason for it.[5] But from what has been said above the dental spelling will be found to be the original one.

(7) *śaṭya, sasya*

Of these two spellings the dental one is to be regarded as original for the following reasons :

(i) The dental spelling is available from Veda onwards, while the palatal spelling is seen only in later literature and two passages of

---

[1] Vide Kauś. 75.8 ; Paipp-S. 18.3.6 ; Śaun-S. 2.36.1 ; 14.1.31 ; 14.2.66-67.

[2] Vide Bhāg. 12.2.8 ; *Śambhala-grāma-mukhyasya Brāhmaṇasya mahātmanaḥ, bhavane Viṣṇu-yaśasaḥ Kalkiḥ prādurbhaviṣyati.*

[3] VP. 4.24.26 : *Bhagavato Vāsudevasyāṁśaḥ Sambhala-grāma-pradhāna-Brāhmaṇa-Viṣṇu-yaśaso gṛhe.....kalki-rūpī avatīrya sakala-mleccha-dasyu-duṣṭācaraṇa-cetasām aśeṣāṇāṁ.....kṣayaṁ kariṣyati.*

[4] Vide VPK. ; VK ; also *Sāy.* on AV., 2.36.1 *āno agne sumatiṁ sambhalaḥ.*

[5] Vide SED ; SW.

a late Vedic text.[1] At least twenty Vedic texts contain the dental spelling.[2]

(ii) In the Epics, Purāṇas, Kāvyas and other literature the dental spelling is met with oftener than the palatal.[3]

(iii) The palatal spelling is not only of fewer occurrence than the dental, but it is almost rare.[4]

(iv) Yāska has discussed *sasya*[5] (dental), but not the other spelling.

---

1 Śaṅkh-Dh. 289 ; 306.

2 Vide—Kapiṣṭh. 30.5 ; Kāṭh-S. 10.3 ; 19.7; 45.17 ; TS. 3.4.3.3; 5.1.7.3 ; 7.5.20.1 ; Paipp-S. 1.10.6.2 ; 5.15.7 ; 5.16.5 ; 15.23.2 ; 16.135.2 ; MS. 4.2.2 ; Śaun-S. 7.12.1 ; 8.13.11-12 ;
TBr. 2.5.5.1 ; ŚBr. 11.2.7.32 ; Śāṅkh-Br. 19.3 ;
A-Pariś. 64.3.6 ; 70.18.4 ; 71.3.6 ; Āpa-Dh. 2.22.24 ; Āśv-Śr. 2.9.2 ; Bhār-Gṛ. 3.3.3 ; Bhār-Śr. 6.18.17 ; Vādh-Śr. 4.12.12 ; Vār-Śr. 3.2.1.30 ; Vi-Dh. 5.140 ; Hir-Dh. 2.5.155 ;
Kaṭh-Up. 1.1.6 ; Piṇḍ-Br-Up. 1.15 ; Śiv-Up. 6.158 ;
Nir. 4.41-42.

3 Some examples are : (*sasya*)—
MBh. 13.3186 : *tathā bhūmi-kṛtaṁ dānaṁ sasye sasye vivardhate* ; R. 2.38.31 : *yā tvaṁ vi-dārya vasudhāṁ śubhaṁ sasyam ivotthitā* ; ibid. 3.49.27 : *sasyānām iva paktaye* ; Bṛh-S. 8.12 : *sasyāni pākam upayānti* ; Kathās. 20.29 : *kāle tatra ca pakveṣu tasya sasyeṣvaśaṅkitam* ; also ibid. 20.30 ; Kumār. 2.44 : *hemāmbho-ruha-sasyānāṁ tad-vāpyo dhāma sāmpratam* ; Cāṇ : *jīrṇam annaṁ pra-śaṁsīyāt bhāryāṁ ca gata-yauvanām, raṇāt pratyāgataṁ śūraṁ sasyaṁ ca gṛham āgatam* ; Rājat. 3.294 : *na bhasmani hutaṁ sarpir noptaṁ vā sasyam ūṣare* .

Also vide Mārk-P. 15.8 ; 61.76 ; Ragh. 1.26, 62 ; 10.48 (according to SW. 10.49) ; 15.58. But different editions of Ragh. give different readings. SW. finds dental spelling in each of these cases ; some editions give the palatal spelling ; both spellings are given in the edition of A. Fridericus (London, 1832).

4 Some of the rare passages of its occurrence are :
śasyaṁ kṣetra-gataṁ prāhuḥ etc. (Smṛti quoted in ŚKD.) ; *gaje ca jaladā devī śasya-pūrṇā vasundharā* (Jyotiṣa-vacana) ; *anurādhā mṛga-śiro revatī cottarā-trayam, hastā citrā maghā puṣyā śravaṇā ca punarvasū, rohiṇī nava-śasyādi-nava-dravyāśanādiṣu, praśastaṁ nava-pīṭhādi-sambhoge graha-vid vadet.* (Mala-māsa-tattva, quoted in ŚKD. and VK).

5 Nir. 9.41-42.

(v) Pāṇini has mentioned the dental spelling, but not the palatal spelling.[1]

(vi) Forms from other IE. languages correspond to the dental spelling : cf. Av. *hahya*, L. *sesamum, sesame*, Gk. *sesamon*, Celt. (*s*) *arium* (rye).[2]

(vii) Some scholars have clearly called the palatal spelling incorrect.[3]

(8) *śāraṅga, sāraṅga*

Of the two, the dental spelling is to be regarded as original on the ground that it occurs from the Veda onwards,[4] while the other spelling is neither noted in the Veda nor is common in later literature.[5]

(9) *śūkara, sūkara*

Of these two, the spelling with the dental s is to be regarded as original for the following reasons :

(i) The dental spelling occurs frequently in the Veda right from the RV. More than a score of Vedic texts contain the spelling.[6]

---

[1] Pāṇ. 5.2.68 *sasyena pari-jātaḥ.*

[2] Vide DSS. p. 515.

[3] Vide SW. and Macdonell's Sanskrit Dictionary.

[4] *sāraṅga* occurs in the following Vedic texts :

Kāṭh-S. 49.1 ; 50.3 ; TS. 5.6.19.1 ; 5.6.23.1 ; Paipp-S. 2.14.2 ; 7.2.6 ; Śaun-S. 2.32.2 ; 5.23.9 ; Ait-Br. 8.21 ; Tāṇḍ. 21.14.8 (*sāraṅgī*). Daiv-Br. 2.2 ; ŚBr. 13.5.4.2 ; Nār-P-Up. 7 ; A-Prā. 3.4.1 ; Āpa-Śr. 20.2.9 ; Upan-S. 8.3 ; Ṛ-Prā. 17.4 ; Baudh-Śr. 15.38.11 ; Śāṅkh-Śr. 16.9.1 ; Hir-Śr. 14.1.21.

In later literature—Uṇ. 1.122; Gaṇ. on Pāṇ. 6.1.94 (*Śakandhvādi*) ; MBh. 7.22.21 ; *ā-krīḍanto vahanti vai sāraṅga-śavalā hayāḥ* ; R. 2.63.16 : *tato jahṛṣire sarve bheka-sāraṅga-varhiṇaḥ* ; Bhāg. 1.11.26 ; 1.18.7 ; 4.30.32 ; Bhaṭṭi. 3.26 ; etc.

[5] *śāraṅga* is noted in : Uṇ. 1.119 ; Megh. 21 (Vide Wilson's Edition) ; Śak. 1.11 (Vide ŚKD.) ; Ud. : *aṣṭau māsān jaladhara tavāpekṣayā śuska-kaṇṭhaḥ śāraṅgo' ham.*

[6] *sūkara*—RV. 7.55.4 ; Kāṭh-S. 47.1 ; Kāṇ-S. 26.8.5 ; TS. 5.5.11.1 ; Paipp-S. 2.16.2 ; 7.1.1 ; MS. 3.14.21 ; VS. 24.40 ; Śaun-S. 2.27.2 ; 5.14.1 ;

Iti-Up. 16.10 ; Ch.-Up. 5.10.7 ; Nār-P-Up. 5.30 (*sūkarī*); Rām-tāp. 4.56 (*saukara*) ; S-Up. 2.93 ;

A-Pariś. 71.3.5 ; 71.7.5 ; Āpa-Śr. 5.26.5 ; 20.14.4 ; Kāś-Dh. 276.8 (Vide VPK) ; Kṣud. 2.16.11 ; Baudh-Śr. 2.5.11 ; Bhār-Śr. 9.9.3 ; Mān-Gṛ. 2.14.11 ; Vādh-Śr. 3.86.13 ; Vār-Śr. 3.4.4.24.

The other spelling occurs only once in the Veda, and that too in a late text.[1]

(ii) Even in later literature the dental spelling is oftener met with than the other.[2]

(iii) Uṇ. and Gaṇ. mention only *sūkara* .

(iv) Forms from other IE. languages are comparable with *sūkara* only : cf.L. *sucula*, AS. *sugu*[3] (>ME. *sowe* > Eng. *sow*), Sw. *sugga*, MLG. *soge*, MD. *sogh* ; etc.

(10) *śyāla, syāla*

Of this pair, too, the dental spelling may be considered original because of its occurrence from the *Ṛgveda*, and scarcity of the other spelling. The dental spelling is frequent both in the Veda and later. The palatal spelling occurs only once in the *Veda*, and that too in a late text[4], and not many times in later literature.[5] The originality of *syāla* (with dental *s*), therefore, is admissible.

There are many more such cases of unoriginal sibilants alternating with the original as will be evident from the list given at the beginning, and the list too is a short selection.

---

[1] Vās-Dh. 6.27. In More's edn., 6.26, dental spelling is given.

[2] *sūkara* :

Bhāg. 3.11.66 ; *yatrāsīt sūkaro Hariḥ* ; also ibid. 8.10.11 ; Kathās. 26.173 : *ut-tiṣṭha sumahān eṣa kuto 'pyuthāya sūkaraḥ, hatāneka-jano darpād ito'bhimukham āgataḥ* ; also ibid. 26.174 ; Gaṇ. on Pāṇ. 4. 2. 80 (*Kṛśāśvādi*) ; Uṇ. ; also VP., R., Bṛh-S. etc. (Vide SED).

śūkara rarely occurs :

gaccha śūkara bhadraṁ te (Subh.) ; *paṇḍitā eva jānanti siṁha-śūkarayor balam* (ibid.) ; *māsam ekaṁ naro yāti, dvau māsau mṛga-śūkarau* (Pancat.).

[3] The *g* of the Teutonic forms for Skt. *k*, L. *c* is by Verner's law. The accent follows *k* (*sūkará*).

[4] *Śaṅkh-Dh.* 43.

[5] *syāla* occurs in : RV. 1.109.2 *a-śravaṁ hi bhūri-dāvat-tarā vāṁ, vi-jāmātur uta vā ghā syālāt* ; Kāṭh-S. 4.15 ; TS. 1.1.14.1 ; Āgni-Gṛ. 1.7.1, 4 ; Vaikh-Gṛ. 5.6.6 ; Ṛk-Prā. 8.34 ; Nir. 6.9 ; Uṇ. 2.3.90 ; R. 6.3.5 ; 7.23.18 ; G. 1.34. In some editions however, the palatal spelling is noticed : VP. 5.23.1 (Vide SW.) ; Kathās. 4.96 ; 90. 96 ; etc. ; Rājat. 4.216.

śyāla occurs in : Śāṅkh-Dh. 43 ; some editions of G. (1.34) ; VP. 5.23.1 (Vide Jivānanda's edition).

9. UNORIGINALITY KNOWN FROM COGNATE FORMS ALONE

Unoriginal sibilants have come to stay in Sanskrit also in some other cases where the original sibilant does not alternate as in the above cases. The unoriginality of the sibilant in such cases is known solely from the evidence furnished by other related languages. Some cases are :

(i) *śaśa* (hare)—Corresponding forms are available from Teutonic ; cf. G. *has, hase,* Du. *haas,* AS. *hara* (> Eng. *hare*). The *r* in the English forms is by Verner's law for original *s* not immediately preceded by *udātta* accent.[1] The *s* of the Teutonic forms may be regarded as an evidence that the sibilant originally was dental in Sanskrit too, which was probably palatalised so early that no trace of it is left in literature. According to Max Muller the initial *ś* is responsible for this change.[2]

(ii) *śvaśura*—Forms from other IE languages show that the initial sibilant in Sanskrit should be dental ; cf. Gk. *hekuros*,L. *socer*, Slav. *svekru*, Goth. *swaihra*, AS. *sweor*, G. *sweher*.. Greek *h*= orig. *s*.

(iii) *śvaśrū*—Similar is the case with *śvaśrū*. The corresponding forms in other languages have an *s* at the beginning. This indicates that the same might originally have been there in Sanskrit also ; cf. L. *socrus*, Slav. *svekry*, AS. *sweger*, Goth. *swigar*, G. *swiger*, *schwieger*.

10. REASON BEHIND OPTIONAL USE OF Ś, S

A word or two may not be out of place here as to why unoriginal sibilants came to alternate with, or even replace, the original sibilants in Sanskrit. One probable reason is that the distinction in pronunciation of palatal and dental sibilants was lost very early, so that the symbols for these sibilants were reckoned as of equal value and were used at will. This assumption gains ground from the following facts :

(i) The change of *ś* to *ch* is an admitted fact ; e.g. *vāk+śūraḥ=vāk-chūraḥ*. This is an indication that *ś* was allowed to be pronounced like *ch* at times. Now, *ch* is not far from *s*. Hence the change (of *ś* to *ch*) means *ś* was losing its original pronunciation and drifting towards *s*. That is to say, palatal and dental sibilants were being pronounced alike.

---

[1] *śaśá* has *udātta* on the final vowel.

[2] LSL. Vol. II. p. 273 ; also vide SED.

(ii) In Middle Indo-Aryan only one sibilant is employed in each dialect, palatal in *Māgadhī*, and dental in the rest. Early effacement of the distinction of the sibilants is doubtless responsible for this rejection of different sibilant symbols.

(iii) In modern Indo-Aryan too the distinction of sibilants is little observed. In Bengali only the palatal sound is heard: *Sītā* is pronounced as *Śītā*, *sā* as *śā* and so on. In Hindi usually the dental sound is heard.

From all this it may be assumed that the sibilants had lost their original values very early, and as a result, unoriginal sibilants came to be used side by side with, or even in supercession of, the original.

11. CONCLUSION

This question of unoriginal sibilants has not been discussed in Paninian[1] grammar. But it was necessary for the sake of determining correct spelling. It cannot be said that the question of spelling does not come within the purview of grammar, but should go to etymology. Patañjali's assertion *duṣṭān śabdān mā pra-yukṣmahi ityadhyeyaṁ vyākaraṇam* sets this objection at rest.

---

[1] Nor in any other system.

TERMS AND THEIR DEFINITIONS

TOO WIDE DEFINITIONS
TOO NARROW DEFINITIONS
NON-DEFINITION
VAGUE DEFINITIONS

[III] TERMS AND THEIR DEFINITIONS

This section of the grammar involves the following weaknesses: (1) Too wide definitions, (2) Too narrow definitions, (3) Non-definition and (4) Vague definitions.

12. TOO WIDE DEFINITIONS

The terms *sarvanāma, nadī, apādāna, sampradāna, karma, samāsa, tat-puruṣa, bahu-vrīhi* and *sat* come in here. (Relevant *sūtras* are quoted below):

(i) *Sarvanāma*—This term becomes wide owing to the inclusion of a number of nouns and adjectives. These are: *alpa, ardha, pūrva, dakṣiṇa, uttara, adhara, avara, antara*[1].

These are not *sarvanāma* or pronouns by any means. Another thing is that these words are sometimes treated as *sarvanāma* and sometimes[2] not. For example, Nom. plur. *pūrve* is *sarvanāma* but *purvāḥ* is not. This is inconsistent.

The obvious reason for regarding these words as *sarvanāma* is their similarity in declension with the real *sarvanāma* words. But outward appearance need not be the testing-ground in the matter of deciding parts of speech. *Pūrva* etc. cannot be called *sarvanāma* in spite of their similarity in declension with *sarvanāma* words.

(ii) *Nadī*—It becomes too wide by the inclusion of both ĭ-and ŭ-stems (fem.)[3]. The term (*nadī*) itself is an example of ī-stems and therefore at most it can stand for the ī-stems. By *nadī* one may be expected to understand all the ĭ-stems (fem.). But there is no palpable reason why the fem. ŭ-stems also are to be understood from it. Had not been *nadī* itself an ĭ-stem but a meaningless word like *ghi ghu* etc. any type or types of stems could have been asked to be understood from it. But *nadī* is not such a word; hence the objection.

---

[1] Pāṇ. 1.1.33-34, 36: *prathama-carama-taya-alpa-ardha-katipaya-nemāś ca; pūrva-para-avara-dakṣiṇa-uttara-apara-adharāṇi vyavasthāyām a-saṁjñāyām; antaraṁ vahir yogopasaṁkhyānayoḥ.*

[2] loc. cit.; also Pāṇ. 1.1.28, 32: *vibhāṣā dik-samāse bahu-vrīhau; vibhāṣā jasi.*

[3] *yūstryākhyau nadī* (1.4.3) etc.

(iii) *Apādāna*—The definition of *apādāna* becomes too wide in the following cases :

(*a*) *vyāghrād bibheti*[1]—The general principle of *apādāna* is not available here. Here there is no *apāya* 'moving away'. There may be such movement sometimes but not necessarily. The question of running away arises when one is in front of a tiger. But when it is said that *sa vyāghrād bibheti* it does not necessarily follow that he is actually in front of a tiger and is running away from it. Therefore in the matter of fearing alone a tiger cannot be an *apādāna*.

This is properly an instance of *hetau pañcamī*[2] like *duḥkhād roditi, dūumād agni-mān* etc. Pāṇini also admits that the tiger is a *bhaya-hetu*.[1] Therefore there is no point in calling it *apādāna* in the same breath.

(*b*) *upādhyāyād adhīte*—The teacher cannot be a *kāraka* of the verb *adhīte* which is done by a student. There cannot be a question —'from whom ?'—in the matter of reading. The relevant questions are : Who ? What ? Where ? Therefore intrumental, dative and ablative cases are not normally possible with the verb meaning 'to read'. The sentence in question may be elliptical for *upādhyāyāt śrutvā adhīte* where *upādhyāya* is *apādāna* of the verb *śru*.

That the teacher is not a necessity in the matter of reading is evident from the *sūtra*[3] too, which says the teacher in a regular (not irregular) study is *apādāna*. If the teacher be a necessity in study, there cannot be the question of regular and irregular study in both of which the teacher is a necessity and hence *apādāna*. Thus by denying *apādānatva* of teacher in irregular study it has been implicitly admitted that the teacher is not *apādāna* in regular study too.

(iv) *Sampradāna*—The term has been made wide by dragging it to cases where there is no question of any give-and-take, such as sentences with the verbs *ruc-*, *krudh-*, *druh-*, *īrṣy-*, *asūy-* and their synonyms, and the

---

[1] by Pāṇ. 1.4.25 : *bhī-trārthānāṁ bhaya-hetuḥ*

[2] Pāṇini has no general rule for *hetau pañcamī*. Probably he did not recognise it and therefore offered other interpretations in such cases. In the above example he finds *apādāne pañcamī* ; in *ekānna-viṁśati* he interprets *ekāt* or *ekād* as *eka+āduk* (Pāṇ. 6.3.76), whereas it is the regular ablative case, the sense being—*not twenty for one*, which is a clear case of *hetau pañcamī*. Also vide Chap, XV, *hetau*, ff.

[3] Pāṇ. 1.4.29 : *ākhyātā upa-yoge*.

verbs *spṛh- dhāri- ślāgh- hnu- sthā-, śap, rādh-, īkṣ-, gṛ-* (with *anu, prati*), and *pari-krī-*[1]. In *śiśave rocate, bhṛtyāya krudhyati, puṣpebhyaḥ spṛhayati, mahyaṁ śataṁ dhārayasi, Kṛṣṇāya ślāghate* (*hnute, tiṣṭhate, śapate*), *Kṛṣṇāya rādhyati* (or *īkṣate*), *hotre anu-* (or *prati*) *gṛṇāti, śatāya pari-krītaḥ* (=hired for a hundred rupees) nothing is being given to anyone. Hence the question of *sampradāna* cannot arise.

Similar is the case with *patye śete*[2].

In all such cases the fourth case-ending is in connection with those verbs, but there is no question of a *kāraka*. These are similar to *mahyam apa-rādhyati, tasminn apa-rādhyati, putre snihyati, a-vi-śvaste vi-śvasiti* etc. which are not noted in Pāṇini.

(v) *Samāsa*—This term becomes too wide in *kṛchrād ā-gataḥ, dūrād ā-gataḥ*, etc. regarded as instances of *samāsa* (*Aluk*[3]). There is no abbreviation whatsoever in such constructions, in the absence of which the term *samāsa* is out of the question[4]. If these are accepted as *samāsa*, then few words will be found outside it or uncompounded. In—

sūta jānāsi bhadraṁ te
bhagavān Sātvatāṁ patiḥ,
Devakyāṁ Vasudevasya
jāto yasya cikīrṣayā[5].

---

[1] Pāṇ. 1.4.33-41 : *rucyarthānāṁ prīyamāṇaḥ* ; *dhārer uttamarṇaḥ* ; etc.

[2] By Vārt. *kriyayā yam abhi-praiti so'pi sampradānam* on Pāṇ. 1.4.32.

[3] Pāṇ. 6.3.2 : *pañcamyāḍ stokādibhyaḥ.*

[4] *samāsa* (<*sam-as-*) means abbreviation, in which sense it is used in literature ; cf. *samāsato bhautikaḥ sargaḥ* (Sāṁkhy-k., 53) ; *mahārāja, na vistarārhāṇi vi-priyāṇi, eṣa samāsaḥ* (Pañcar., Act II). The abbreviation is effected in two ways in a samāsa—(1) by dropping words or case-endings or both (e.g., *rāja-puruṣaḥ* < *rājñaḥ purusaḥ*, where case-ending is dropped ; *nīla-kaṇṭhaḥ* < *nīlaḥ kaṇṭho yasya*, where the case-ending in *nīlaḥ* and the word *yasya* are dropped ; *śāka-pārthivaḥ* < *śāka-priyaḥ pārthivaḥ*, where the word *priyaḥ* is dropped) ; (2) by pronouncing or writing the members of the compound in close succession without any intervening time or space. In *dūrād āgataḥ* etc., even if the second kind of abbreviation is admitted, though it is hardly possible to do so, the other kind being wanting, the abbreviation is not complete. Hence no question of samāsa . If only closeness (temporal or spatial) could be called samāsa, then *odanaṁ pacati* etc. would be examples of samāsa, but this is not the case. Mere closeness is called *saṁhitā*, not *samāsa*. It is noteworthy here that neither Pāṇini, nor his followers have stressed the need for abbreviation in samāsa.

[5] Bhāg., 1.1.12.

bhagavān sātvatāṁ patiḥ, Vasudevasya jātaḥ, Devakyāṁ jātaḥ etc. are, in that case, to be regarded as compounded. Besides, *rājñaḥ putraḥ, rājñaḥ puruaṣaḥ,* etc. will claim recognition as *samāsa* by the side of *rāja-putraḥ, rāja-puruṣaḥ,* etc.

As a matter of fact, the so-called *Aluk-samāsa*s are no *samāsa* at all. These are rather the antithesis of *nitya-samāsa*. As the latter are always compounded, so the former always uncompounded. If *dūrād āgataḥ* etc. were ever in use, these are not to be called *samāsa*, but rather *nitya-a-samāsa*, if the regular compounded form (*durāgata* etc.) was not allowed.

(vi) *Tat-puruṣa*—This term becomes wide when required to include compounds other than the *ṣaṣṭhī-tat-puruṣa*. The term itself is an example of *ṣaṣṭhī-samāsa* (*tasya puruṣaḥ=tat-puruṣa*), and therefore it cannot properly stand for compounds other than that. But it has been made to do it.

(vii) *Bahu-vrīhi*—This term is an example of *Bahu-vrīhi* compound of the *samānādhikaraṇa* type (*bahavaḥ vrīhayaḥ yasya*) and therefore cannot include the *vyadhikaraṇa* type. Since it is employed to include that too, the term is made too wide.

(viii) *Sat*—The term *sat*[1] itself being a derivative of the suffix *-śatṛ*, it can stand for *-śatṛ* alone, but not for *-śānac* as well. Since the term is made to denote both, there is too wide application.

13. TOO NARROW DEFINITIONS

(i) *Prātipadika*—This is definied as 'that which has got a sense, excluding verbal roots and suffixes. Derivatives of *kṛt* and *taddhita* suffixes, and compound words also are reckoned as *prātipadikas*[2]. This definition leaves out stems with fem. suffixes. Hence the narrowness of the definition.

It cannot be said that such feminine stems are based on the masculine stems and need not be separately mentioned as a class of stems. For *taddhita* derivatives also are based on masculine stems[3] (e.g., *nara-tva* < *nara*), yet they are recognised as a class of stems. So fem. stems too are

---

1 Pāṇ. 3.2.127 : *tau sat.*

2 Pāṇ. 1.2.45-46 : *arthavad a-dhātur a-pratyayaḥ prātipadikam* ; *kṛt-taddhita-samāsāś ca.* Also cf. Pāṇ. 2.3.46 : *prātipadikārtha-liṅga-parimāṇa-vacana-mātre prathamā* and Pāṇ. 4.1.1. *ṅī-āp-prātipadikāt*, which make this discrimination, *prātipadika* and feminine bases being separately stated therein.

3 =stems without fem. suffixes.

to be recognised as such[1]. Such stems are derived stems like *kṛt-* and *taddhita* derivatives.

(ii) *pada*—The definition *sup-tiṅ-antaṁ padam*[2] (a *pada* is that which ends in either *sup* or *tiṅ*) is narrow because there are *padas* without *sup or tiṅ*. They are :

(1) The nom. sing. of consonant stems, *ṛ*-stems, and fem. *ā-* and *ī*-stems; e.g., *vāk, bhū-bhṛt, pitā, latā, nadī.*

(2) Nom. and acc. sing. of neuter stems other than *a*-stems ; e.g,. *vāri, madhu.*

(3) Voc. sing. of all stems ; e.g. *nara, mune, sādho, nadi, late* etc. ; also the duals *munī, late* etc.

(4) In Veda some other cases are seen without *sup ;* e.g,. *su-ṣṭutī* (instr. sing.), *rājan* (loc. sing.), *puru*[3] (nom. acc. plur. neuter)

(5) *nipātas—ca, vā, pra* etc.

Examples of *pada* without *tiṅ* are : *a-kar a-han, gaccha,* etc.

In all such cases *sup* or *tiṅ* is wanting. Yet they are regarded as *pada*. Paninian view is that *sup* or *tiṅ* is elided[4] in such cases, so that they cannot be regarded as totally *sup-* or *tiṅ*-less. This is untenable. For—

(*a*) If absence of anything is interpreted as the result of elision, then anything can be admitted anywhere, which is undesirable and impossible.

(*b*) There is no need for the nom. sing. ending. It adds nothing to the sense. The stem *nara* and the nom. sing. *nara-s* have the same sense. For dual and plural senses ending may be necessary, but singular sense is available from the bare stem. This being the case *sup*-less nom. sing. forms (*vāk, nadī, etc.*) are quite natural and reasonable things. Those with *sup* are rather unnatural.

---

[1] "It is curious Pāṇini does not regard words ending in feminine suffixes as *prātipadikas*....." (K. C. Chatterjee—*Technical Terms and Techniques of Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 58).

[2] Pāṇ. 1.4.14.

[3] T. Burrow—*Sans. Lang.* p. 236.

[4] Pāṇ. 6.1.68 (*hal-ṅī-ābbhyo dīrghāt su-ti-si-apṛktaṁ hal*) ; 7.1.39 (*supāṁ su-luk.....*) ; 8.2.23 (*saṁ-yogāntasya lopaḥ*) 2.4.82 (*avyayād āp-supaḍ*).

(*c*) Not *sup* but vowel-change is responsible for many formations, such as *munī, late, agne, sādho*, etc. which has not been noted in Pāṇini. There are three types of case forms—those with *sup*, those without sup but with a vowel-change, and those without both. In Pāṇini all are regarded as *sup*-forms.

(*d*) Many other *sup*-less forms are used in sentences such as *nara iva, gajā ime*, etc. This is regarded as due to *sandhi*. But if *sandhi* is causing the elision here, why is it that in *nadī, latā* etc. (nom.) the elision is automatic ?

(*e*) In Greek and Latin which too have inflected forms there are uninflected forms as well. For example in Gk. nom. sing. (masc. and fem.) the ending is said to be "s or none", in voc. "none" in vowel declension, and in nom. acc. voc. sing. neut. in consonant declension also "none". In nom. voc. acc. dual in vowel declension too the ending is "none"[1].

It has not been claimed that the ending is elided. The "none" is simply utter negation (*atyantābhāva*, not *pra-dhvaṁs-ābhāva*) of the endings.

(*f*) Pāṇini himself has often used uninflected forms.[2] The omission of endings in all these cases need not be a special

---

[1] Goodwin—*Greek Grammar*; also cf. Curtius —*Smaller Grammar of the Greek Language*, pp. 8, 15, 17-18: (i) The masculine takess, the feminine no case-ending: (ii) In consonant declension the vocative has no ending in masculine and feminine; and nom. acc. voc. have no ending in the neuter. (iii) In the dental stems the nom. sing. masc. and fem. is formed with or without sigma. (iv) The neuter has the pure stem in the nom. acc. voc. singular. (v) The vocative of masc. and fem. sometimes has the pure stem.

[2] *cf* (1) *dā dhā ghu a-dāp* (1.1.20); (2) *aco' ntyādi ṭi* (1.1.64) but cf. *ṭita ātmane-padānāṁ ṭer e* (3.4.79), where masc. ending is clear; (3) *cli luṅi* (3.1.43), but cf. *cleḥ sic* (3.1.44) with ending; (4) *nanas ta ca* (3.1.108); (5) *sthaḥ ka ca* (3.2.77), *stambe ka ca* (3.3.83), *rājñaḍ ka ca* (4.2.140); but cf. *gehe kaḥ* (3.1.144), *ig-upadha-jñā-prī-kiraḥ kaḥ* (3.1.135), etc. Where ending appears; (6) *hano vadha liṅi* (2.4.42); but cf. *hanaś ca vadhaḥ* (3.3.76); (7) *Kṛñaḥ śa ca* (3.3.100), but cf. *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ* (3.1.77); (8) *a pratyayūt* (3.3.102), *ṛk-pūr-al-dhūh-pathām a anakṣe* (5.4.74), *a a iti* (8.4.68); also 4.3.9; 4.3.31; but again *bhavater aḥ* (7.2.73); (9) *khano gha ca* (3.3.125), but again *taraṇ. tamapau ghaḥ* (1.1.22), *kṣatrād ghaḥ* (4.1.138); (10) *vano ra ca*, but cf. *ro' supi* (8.2.69; (11) *ch ca* (4.2.28), *putrāc cha ca* (5.1.40), *jātyantāc cha baudhuni* (5.4.9.), etc.; but cf. *utkarādibhaśchaḥ* (4.2.90),

privilege of the sūtra language, for it is nowhere stated that such omissions can be made by a grammarian in framing his rules.

(*g*) *nipātas* cannot be believed to have dropped endings. In view of the above it may be held that total absence of inflection is a fact in many cases, and it is not the result of elision of endings after their addition.

In fact this is the starting-point of later large-scale non-use of endings in the Sanskritic languages. In Sanskrit only in a few cases ending was avoided in non-sing. But in the Middle Indo-Aryan and Modern Indo-Aryan languages it is avoided almost in every stem ; cf. Bengali, Hindi etc. *Rāma, Hari, Viṣṇu* (nom. sing.), *sav bālak, anek pustak* (nom. plur.) ; Apabhraṁśa—*Paṇḍia saala sattha vakkhānai* (=a paṇḍita explains all śāstras), where in nom. sing. and acc. plur. a-stems are endingless ; Prākṛta—*Piyadasi* (nom. Sing.), *aggī, vāū* (nom. sing. plur.) ; Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit—*vrajatāyu jage yatha vidyu nabhe* (=life in the world passes away like the lightning in the sky), where *āyu* and *vidyu* are endingless.

Thus there being *padas* without *sup* or *tiṅ* the definition of *pada* becomes too narrow.

(iii) *apādāna*—Narrowness of *apādāna-saṁjñā* arises from the word *dhruva* (fixed, stationary) in the sūtra. Not only *dhruva* things but also the moving can be the starting point and hence *apādāna. dhāvato' śvāt patati*—is not available under the sūtra. Patañjali's contention that even in a running horse there is a *dhruva thing*, and that is its horseness (*aśvāt trastāt patita iti yat tad aśve' śvatvam āśu-gāmi-tvaṁ dhṛuvam, tac ca vivakṣitam*) is not convincing. For one does not fall from horseness, but from the horse, which is of course not *dhruva*. Later grammarians interpret *dhruva* as *avadhi-bhūtaṁ kārakam*[1] so as to include both the stationary and the moving. But such a sense of the word not being already or else-

ṭhakchau ca (4.2.84), etc. ; (12) *patho ṇa nityam* (5.1.76), but cf. *tad asyāṁ pra-haraṇam iti krīḍāyāṁ naḥ* (4.2.57) ; (13) *jya ca* (5.3.61), but cf. *praśasyasya śraḥ* (5.3.60) ; (14) *eka taddhite ca* (6.3.62), *eka bahu-brīhi-vat* (8.1.9). This is important, for while in other cases affixes and substitutes are left uninflected, here a word with meaning is uninflected.

More cases of un-inflection are in the sūtras : 3.3.125 ; 4.1.17 ; 4.3.29 ; 4.4.129 ; 132 ; 6.3.96 ; 6.4.142, 158 ; 7.1.29 ; 7.3.52 ; 8.4.15.

[1] Vide *Kāś.* and *SK.*

where admitted, it cannot be done so here. This will be only an undue justification of the sūtra.

14. NON-DEFINITION

Another inconsistency in the *saṁ-jñā-pra-karaṇa* is the non-definition of a number of terms both simple and difficult. There are:

Upa-sthita, upottama, eka-śruti, sanna-tara, sthānī.[1] Of the simplerterms left out the following may be noted: *kāraka, vi-bhakti, samāsa, ādeśa, karma-pra-vacanīya, bahula, kṛt, taddhita,* etc.

It cannot be said that these terms were not defined because their meanings were known to all. Why are *dhātu, prātipadika, laghu, guru, saṁhitā* etc. defined? Were their meanings unknown to all? Not so. For some of the terms are met with in Yāska, such as *saṁhitā, nipāta, upasarga* etc. Yāska is admittedly a predecessor of Pāṇini, yet Pāṇini defined them. Even if Yāska is placed after Pāṇini, there were no dearth of grammarians preceding him. Such are Śākaṭāyana, Gārgya, Gālava, Āpiśali, Senaka etc. whom Pāṇini himself has mentioned. Is it not possible that most of the grammatical terms had already been made common knowledge by the writings of this galaxy of grammarians? There were the *Prātiśākhya* writers as well.

Therefore it comes to this that the terms defined by Pāṇini were not necessarily unknown. If he defined the known terms, he should not have avoided defining the other terms, whether known or unknown. This deficiency of the *sūtra-kāra* is to some extent made up by the *Bhāṣya-kāra* who has generally explained the terms left by Pāṇini. Yet not all have received his attention too. For example, *upottama, Kṛt, taddhita,* etc. are not explained there.

15. VAGUE DEFINITIONS

The definitions of *udātta, anudātta* and *svarita* are left vague, so that different interpretations of them have been possible.

(i) *Udātta, anudātta—uccair udāttaḥ, nicair anudāttaḥ*[2]—these have been interpreted in two ways: (*a*) *udātta*=produced or uttered from the upper part of the organ of articulation; *anudātta*=produced from the lower

---

[1] For these terms vide Pāṇ. 6.1.129; 6.1.217; 1.2.33; 1.2.40; 1.1.56; etc.

[2] Pāṇ. 1.2.29-30

part; (*b*) udātta=high tone; anudātta=low tone[1].

This view is held by all western scholars as well.

Now, this duality of opinion is due to the vagueness in the sūtras. If the sense was 'produced from upper or lower part' or otherwise, it should have been made clear in the sūtras.

Here the view of the *Bhāṣya* is not easy to grasp : *samāne pra-krama iti vaktavyam. Kaḥ punaḥ pra-kramaḥ ? uraḥ kaṇṭhaḥ śira iti.* Commentator Kaiyaṭa has taken it 'in the first sense noted above. But undoubtedly the obscurity of the *Bhāṣya* passage has rather helped the second sense. The first sense (from upper, lower part etc.) as proposed by the commentator is far-fetched ; the second (high, low etc.) natural and direct. Owing to the vagueness in the sūtras and the *Bhāṣya* it has been possible to differ with the commentators and advocate the other sense (a more reasonable one[2])

There are a number of lengthy sūtras in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Two or three words more in the above sūtras for the sake of clarity would not have increased the bulk considerably, but that would have kept away the later controversy.

---

[1] cf. *ekasmiṁs tālvādike sthāne ūrdhvādhara-bhāga ukte ūrdhva-bhāgenoccārya-māṇa udāttaḥ, adhara-bhāga-niṣ-panno 'nudāttaḥ. uccair ityanena ūrdhva-bhāgo gṛhyate, nīcair ityadhara-bhāgaḥ.*

—*Prad.*

.....yaḥ samāne sthāne ūrdhva-bhāga-nīṣpanno'c sa ūdātta-saṁjño bhavati.....nīca-bhāge niṣpanno'c anudāttaḥ.

—*Kaṣ.*

tālvādiṣu sa-bhāgeṣu sthāneṣu ūrdhva-bhāge niṣpanno'j udātta-saṁjñah syāt.

—*SK.*

sa (=udātta) tu Veda-gāne uccaiḥ-svaraḥ.

—*Amar.*

uccair ā-dīyate uccāryate udāttaḥ.

ŚKD (*on svara*).

This view is held by all Western scholars as well.

Vide Macdonell's *Vedic Grammar* p. 448; Monier Williams—*Practical Sanskrit Grammar* pp. 14-15 ; Whitney. *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 28.

[2] *udātta ud* (upwards) *ātta* (taken), i.e., raised ; cf. *ud-gṛhīta* (Megh. 8) ; hence *anudātta* not raised, normal. Besides, the rise and fall of tones are qualities of vowels, which remain unnamed, if *udātta* etc. are interpreted the other way (i.e., from upper part etc.).

(ii) *svarita*—The definition of *svarita*[1] is based on those of *udātta* and *anudātta*. Hence the vagueness that attaches to *udātta* and *anudātta* touches *svarita* also. It has the added vagueness caused by the use of the word *ardha-hrasva* in the next sūtra (*tasyādita udāttam ardha-hrasvam*, 1-2-32) elaborating the definition. For what actually is intended by this is not clear. Commentators are divided in their opinion about its purport: (1) The *Bhāṣya-kāra* feels that the use of this word makes it impossible for long and prolated vowels to be *svarita* (*ardha-hrasvam ityucyate tatra dīrgha-plutayor na prāpnoti*). For the word *hrasva* seems to indicate that only *hrasva* (short) vowels can be *svarita*. As a way out of this he says that here the suffix *-mātrac* should be supposed to have been elided, so that *ardha-hrasvam=ardhahrasva-mātram* (to the extent of half the length of a short wovel) (*mātraco'tra lopo draṣṭavyaḥ. ardha-hrasva-mātram ardha-hrasvam*). (2) Kaiyaṭa is of the opinion that *ardha-hrasva* is a term of measurement in the sense of *ardha-mātrā*. (*ardha-hrasva-śabdaḥ pramāṇavācī rūḍhi-śabdaḥ.....ardhamātrā tu anenābhidhīyate*). (3) Horadatta, Jayāditya and Bhaṭṭojī have regarded the word *hrasva* as *a-tantra* (unnecessary) (*hrasva-grahaṇam-a-tantram*).[2] The sense *ardha-mātrā* is admitted by the first two, and also by Bhaṭṭojī in his *śabda-kaustubha* (*svaritasyādāv ardha-mātrā udāttaṁ bodhyam*). (4) Bhaṭṭojī in his *Siddhānta-kaumudī* holds that *ardha-hrasva* is half (*hrasva-grahaṇama-tantram, svarita-syādāv ardham udattāṁ bodhyam*).

Thus the *svarita*, like the other two pitches, remains a vague tone, it being not clear whether only half a *mātrā* or just half of a *svarita* vowel should be *udātta*. The vagueness could not come in, if the sūtra read clearly: *tasyādito' rdham udāttam*, or *tasyādita udāttam ardha-mātrā*.

Apart from the divergence of opinion among the commentators, there is another factor which definitely proves the vagueness of the three pitches left by the grammarians. This is that *udātta* etc. disappeared from the language very early and there is no trace of them in the post-Vedic Sanskrit. If the pitches had been clearly understood they would not have died out so early. Their exact nature was forgotten and consequently they fell into disuse and extinction. True, a few Vedic singers are still available in India. But their knowledge is not derived from grammar but from practical training at the hands of the older generation in the family.

---

[1] Pāṇ. 1.2.31: *samāhāraḥ svaritaḥ* (*svarita* is a mixture of *udātta* and *anudātta*)

[2] Vide *Kāś. SK.* and *Padam*.

Another thing. The tones that went by the names of *udātta* etc. in the Vedic age are doubtless continuing in the modern Indian music which dates from the Puranic age. Before the Puranic age there was the Vedic music of three principal tones *udātta, anudātta* and *svarita* and three more rare ones *uccaistara*[1] (=a higher *udātta*), *sanna-tara*[2] (a lower *anudātta*) and *eka-śruti*[3]. These were replaced by the seven tones : *ṣaḍja, ṛṣabha, gāndhāra, madhyama, pañcama, dhaivata* and *ni-ṣāda* in the Puranic age. There can be little doubt that these later tones are based on the earlier tones and cannot be materially different. Had it not been so, the Vedic music should have existed side by side with the Puranic (whence modern music).

But though *udātta* etc. are presumaly existent in the modern music in other names (*ṣaḍja, ṛṣabha* etc.), these have not been recognised as such so far. This is due to the vagueness attaching to the definitions of *udātta* etc. in grammar. A known face can be recognised in any identification parade. But the faces of *udātta* etc. have not been made so clear in grammar that they may be recognised from among the seven tones.

16. MISCELLANEOUS

In addition to the above a few more deficiencies in definition may be noted here : (i) The definition of *karma* that it is the *īpsita-tama*[4] (most desired) as well as *an-īpsita*[4] (not desired) is contradictory. How can the same thing be both 'desired' and 'not desired' ? (ii) The definition of *karaṇa* that it is the *sādhaka-tama*[5] (best performer) is misplaced, for none other than the *kartā* can have that honour. *karaṇa* is a mere tool at the hand of the *kartā*. (iii) The definition of *kartā* that it is *sva-tantra*[6] is more philosophic than grammatical. In grammar the position of the *kartā* is hardly understandable from this definition. (iv) The definition of *sam-pradāna* that it is the intended person by the *karma*[7] is beside the point, for the term shows that it is concerned with *sampra-dāna* (making gifts), but nothing is said about it in the definition.

---

[1] Pāṇ. 1.2.35 : *uccaistarāṁ vā vaṣaṭ-kāraḥ.*

[2] ibid. 1.2.40 : *udātta-svarita-parasya sanna-taraḥ.*

[3] ibid. 1.2.33-34 : *eka-śruti dūrāt sambuddhau* etc.

[4] Pāṇ. 1.4.49-50 : *Kartur īpsitatamaṁ karma ; tathā' yuktaṁ cānīpsitam.*

[5] ibid. 1.4.42 : *sādhakatamaṁ karaṇam.*

[6] Pāṇ. 1.4.54 : *svatantraḍ kartā*

[7] ibid. 1.4.32 : *karmaṇā yam abhi-praiti sa sampradānam.*

CLASSIFICATION OF SUFFIXES—HOW FOR JUSTIFIED

NO DIFFERENT SETS OF SUFFIXES

EXAMPLES OF CLASSLESSNESS

CONCLUSION

[IV] CLASSIFICATION OF SUFFIXES— HOW FOR JUSTIFIED

17. NO DIFFERENT SETS OF SUFFIXES

The classification of suffixes into *kṛt, taddhita, strī* (fem. suff.), *sup* and *tiṅ* is unnecessary, for such different sets do not exist. It will be seen that there is only a single set or group of suffixes which function differently at different times. The same suffix may serve as all or several of the above categories. It is not the suffixes, but their functions which are different. Therefore it is not proper to call the very same suffix by different names simply because it serves different purposes. A man may perform a number of duties, but he does not become different thereby. He may sometimes be called by the name of the job, but his identity through all his performances is always the same. In the same way the suffixes are to be called by their original or permanent names[1]. *Kṛt, taddhita* etc. are to be regarded as their temporary functions, not permanent associations.

18. EXAMPLES OF CLASSLESSNESS

From the following list of suffixes and their functions the ultimate unity or classlessness of the suffixes will be clear :

Suffixes	Panīnian names	Uses or functions		Examples
1. -a	*(i) ac*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*kṣam- a, cal- a ; stambe-ram-a ; etc.*
		2.	*taddhita*	*arśas-a, uras-a*
		2.a	*samāsānta*	*brahma-varcas-a, andha-tamas-a etc.*
	(ii) aṇ	*1.*	*kṛt*	*kumbha-kāra*
		2.	*taddhita*	*tākṣaṇa, ātharvaṇa*
2. -aka	*vuñ*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*nind-aka, hiṁs-aka*
		2.	*taddhita*	*rāj-aka*
3. -am	*ṇamul, am*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*vipra-darś-am*
		2.	*sup*	*bhū-bhṛt-am, vaṇij-am, etc.*
		3.	*tiṅ*	*a-vas-am, a-has-am*
4. -ā	*a+ṭāp*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*bhāṣ-ā, day-ā, etc.*
	ḍāc	*2.*	*taddhita*	*sukhā-karoti, śūlā-karoti, etc.*

[1] *a, ā, ya* etc.

Suffixes	Panīnian names	Uses or functions		Examples
	ṭāp	*3.*	*strī*	*nāyikā, śudrā etc.*
	ṭā	*4.*	*sup*	*bhū-bhṛt-ā, vaṇij-ā etc. (instr. sing.)*
	—	*5.*	*tiṅ*	*b h a v ā etc. (Leṭ Ist per. sing.)*
	—	*6.*	*vikaraṇa*	*bhav-ā-ti etc. (Leṭ)*
5. -i	*in*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*stamba-kar-i, śakṛt-kar-i, phale-grah-i etc.*
	iñ	*2.*	*taddhita*	*Ārjuni, Dāśarathi etc.*
	ic, it	*2.a*	*samāsānta*	*keśākeśi, su-gandhi etc.*
	—	*3.*	*strī*	*jan-i (woman), yuvat-i*
	ṅi	*4.*	*sup*	*vaṇij-i, mās-i etc.*
	iṭ	*5.*	*tiṅ*	*ās-i (<ās+Laṅ Ist. per. sing.), a-kār-i etc.*
	iṭ	*6.*	*vi-karaṇa*	*pat-i-ta, paṭh-i-tum etc.*
6. -in	*ini*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*jayin, kṣayin etc.*
		2.	*taddhita*	*sukhin, dhanin etc.*
	ṇini	*1.*	*kṛt*	*mantr-in, sthāy-in etc.*
		2.	*taddhita*	*Kāśyapin*
7. -ina	*inuṇ*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*sāṁkūṭina, sāṁrāviṇa*
	ina, inac[1]	*2.*	*taddhita*	*pūrviṇa, śṛṅgiṇa*
8. -i	*ñīp etc.*	*1.*	*strī*	*nārī, su-keśī etc.*
	cvi	*2.*	*taddhita*	*śuklī-bhavati etc.*
	īṭ	*3.*	*vi-karaṇa*	*ās-ī-t, a-rod-ī-t etc.*
9. -uka	*ukañ, khukañ*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*kāmuka, gāmuka, bhāvuka etc.*
	ukañ	*2.*	*taddhita*	*kārmuka*
10. -ū	*ūṅ*	*1.*	*strī*	*gurū, vāmorū etc.*
	cvi	*2.*	*taddhita*	*arū-karoti etc.*
11. -e	*ṅi, ṅe*	*1.*	*sup*	*nare, bhū-bhṛt-e etc.*
	śap+iṭ, eś	*2.*	*tiṅ*	*sev-e, da-dṛś-e etc.*
	—	*3.*	*vi-karaṇa*	*sev-e te sev-e-the etc.*
12. -eṇya	—	*1.*	*kṛt*	*var-eṇya*
	eṇya, ṭeṇyaṇ	*2.*	*taddhita*	*prāvṛṣ-eṇya vārk-eṇya*
13. -eya	*yat*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*deya, peya etc.*
	ḍha, ḍhak, ḍhañ	*2.*	*taddhita*	*āgneya, Rādheya etc.*[1]

[1] *śṛṅgād inac-pratyayo nipātyate.* (Kāś. on Pāṇ. 5.2.114).

Suffixes		Panīnian names	Uses or functions		Examples
14.	*-ka*	*kta*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*śuṣ-ka*
		ka, kan etc.	*2.*	*taddhita*	*aśva-ka, māṇava-ka, paitṛ-ka, rājanya-ka etc.*[2]
			2a.	*samāsānta*	*nadī-mātṛ-ka etc.*
15.	*-t*	*tuk+kvip*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*puṇya-kṛ-t, śastra-bhṛ-t etc.*
		—	*2.*	*tiṅ*	*a-bhū-t, a-da-dā-t, a-dā-t etc.*
16.	*-ta*	*kta*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*kṛ-ta, bhū-ta etc.*
		ta	*2.*	*taddhita*	*kan-ta, śan-ta*
		ta	*3.*	*tiṅ*	*a-kṛ-ta, a-sev-a-ta etc.*
17.	*-tana*	*tanap*	*1.*	*taddhita*	*purā-tana, sāyan-tana etc.*
		—	*2.*	*tiṅ*	*kuru-tana etc.*[3]
18.	*-tas*	*tas, tasi etc.*	*1.*	*taddhita*	*sarva-tas, ta-tas, pūrva-tas etc.*
		tas	*2.*	*tiṅ*	*bhav-a-tas, yā-tas etc.*
19.	*-tāt*	*astāti*	*1.*	*taddhita*	*puras-tāt, adhas-tāt etc.*
		tātaṅ	*2.*	*tiṅ*	*bhav-a-tāt etc.*
20.	*-ti*	*ktin*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*kṛ-ti, prī-ti etc.*
		ti, til, ḍati	*2.*	*taddhita*	*pakṣa-ti, vṛka-ti*[4] *ka-ti etc.*
		tip	*3.*	*tiṅ*	*bhav-a-ti etc.*
21.	*-tu*	—	*1.*	*tiṅ*	*bhav-a-tu etc.*
		tu	*2.*	*taddhita*	*kan-tu, śan-tu*
		—	*3.*	*kṛt*	*gā-tu* (road), *pi-tu* (food, drink), *ṛ-tu, vas-tu ;* also the stem in *gantu-m, gantave- karto-s etc. : cf* L. *statu-s* (=Skt.* *sthāthu-s*).
22.	*-tya*	*tuk+kyap*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*bhṛ-tya, kṛ-tya etc.*
		tuk+lyap			*ā-ga-tya, vi-ji-tya etc.*
		tyak, tyap	*2.*	*taddhita*	*pāścāt-tya, tatra-tya, amātya etc.*

[1] Vide Pān. 4.1.119-142 ; 5.2.2 ; 5.3.102.

[2] Pāṇ. 5.3.70-96 ; 4.2.53, 61, 103 ; 4.3.147 ; 4.4.21 ; 5.1.75 etc.

[3] In Veda only.

[4] A *taddhita* suffix *-ti* is admitted in *yuvati* also by Pāṇini.

Suffixes	Panīnian names	Uses or functions		Examples
23. *-tra*	*ṣṭran*	1.	*kṛt*	*śas-tra, sto-tra etc.* *po-tra, also car-i-tra, vah-i-tra, kṣe-tra etc.*
	tral	2.	*taddhita*	*atra, tatra, go-tra etc.*
24. *-tha*	*tha, thal*	1.	*tiṅ*	*bhav-a-tha, ja-gam-itha etc.*
	ḍaṭ+thaṭ, thuk	2.	*taddhita*	*catur-tha, kati-tha etc.*
25. *-na*	*kta, naṅ, nan*	1.	*kṛt*	*anna, bhinna, praśna, yat-na, svap-na etc.*
	nañ, na	2.	*taddhita*	*strai-ṇa, jyots-nā*
	śnam	3.	*vi-karaṇa*	*bhi-na-tti etc.*
26. *-nā*	*ṭā* replaced by *nā*	1.	*sup*	*muni-nā, sādhu-nā etc.*
	śnā	2.	*vi-karaṇa*	*lu-nā-ti etc.*
27. *-nī*	*na+ṅīp*	1.	*strī*	*pat-nī* (also *Indrāṇī, Rudrāṇī* etc. with *ā-nī*)
		2.	*sup*	*madhu-nī etc.*
28. *-m*	*am*	1.	*sup*	*nara-m, phala-m etc.*
	—	2.	*tiṅ*	*a-yā-m, a-dā-m etc.*
	amu	3.	*taddhita*	*pra-tara-m*
29. *-ma*	*kta>ma*	1.	*kṛt*	*kṣā-ma, pra-stī-ma*
	ḍaṭ+maṭ ; ma	2.	*taddhita*	*pañca-ma, madhya-ma ; dru-ma.*
		3.	*tiṅ*	*a-yā-ma, yā-ma etc.*
30. *-ya*	*yat, kyap, ṇyat, lyap*	1.	*kṛt*	*śak-ya, sah-ya, Brahma-bhū-ya, kār-ya , bhoj-ya, paṇḍitam-man-ya, ā-nī-ya, sam-bhū-ya etc.*
	yat, ya, yañ, ṣyañ, ayac etc.	2.	*taddhita*	*dharmya, grāmya, Gārgya, māhātm-ya, rājan-ya, dva-ya, ubha-ya etc.*
	śyan	3.	*vi-karaṇa*	*dīv-ya-ti, bhrām-ya-ti etc.*
	yak, yaṅ etc.	4.	*semi-vi-karaṇa*	*gam-ya-te, jaṅgam-ya -te, kaṇḍū-ya-te, putrā-ya-te, gam-a-ya-ti etc.*
	ya	5.	*sup*	*narā-ya*[1]

[1] *ṅer ya-ḥ*, Pān. 7.1.13.

Suffixes	Panīnian names	Uses or functions		Examples
31. -ra	*ra*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*nam-ra, sme-ra etc.*
	ra	*2.*	*taddhita*	*madhu-ra, uṣa-ra etc. kuṭī-ra etc.*
	ruṭ	*3.*	*vi-karaṇa*	*śe-ra-te, saṁ-vid-ra-te, a-duh-ra*
32. -la	*kta>la*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*phul-la*
	ṭalañ, lac	*2.*	*taddhita*	*śāmī-la cuḍā-la sidhma-la, vatsa-la, phena-la*
33. -v	*kta>va*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*pak-va*
	va	*2.*	*taddhita*	*Keśa-va*
	—	*3.*	*tiṅ*	*yā-va, a-yā-va etc.*
34. -van	*kvanip, vanip, ḍvanip*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*su-dhī-van, prātar-it-van, pāra-dṛś-van, rāja-kṛt-van, saha-yudh-van, bhuri-dā-van, agre-gā-van, yaj-van etc.*
	—	*2.*	*taddhita*	*magha-van*
35. -vas	*śatṛ, kvasu*	*2.*	*kṛt*	*vid-vas, jagm-i-vas etc.*
		2.	*tiṅ*	*yā-vas, han-vas etc.*
36. -s	*su*	*1.*	*sup*	*nara-s, muni-s etc.*
	—	*2.*	*tiṅ*	*a-bhava-s, bhave-s etc.*
	sic	*3.*	*vi-karaṇa*	*a-jñā-s-ī-t etc.*
37. -sya	*sya*	*1.*	*sup*	*nara-sya etc.*
	sya	*2.*	*tiṅ (or vi-karaṇa)*	*yā-sya-ti*
	asuk+kyac	*3.*	semi-*vi-karaṇa*	*aśva-sya-ti etc.*
38. -syat	*syatṛ*	*1.*	*kṛt*	*yā-syat, bhav-i-ṣyat etc.*
		2.	*tiṅ*	*a-bhav-i-ṣyat etc.*
39. -hi	—	*1.*	*tiṅ*	*yā-hi, pā-hi etc.*
	rhil	*2.*	*taddhita*	*tar-hi, karhi etc.*[1]

[1] The suffix may not be *-rhil*, but *-hi*. The *r* may have developed from the stem-final *d*. The Bhāṣya (I) has recorded two instances of such a change: *yarvāṇaḥ, tarvāṇaḥ* for *yadvā naḥ, tadvā naḥ*.

19. CONCLUSION

That same suffixes have been differently used is amply illustrated by the above examples. True, there are suffixes which have only one use i.e., either *kṛt*, or *taddhita* or any other. But that makes little difference in the situation. Almost all the suffixes of common use are in the above list, and this ought to weigh more in a decision.

This multiple use of the suffixes, or their classlessness was not noted in Pāṇini.[1]

---

[1] Prof. T. Burrow has admitted the uselessness of *kṛt* and *taddhita* divisions. He says—"Convenient as this two-fold classification is from the point of view of Sanskrit itself, it has no fundamental or ancient significance from the point of view of Indo-European" (vide *Sans. Lang.* p. 119). But not only *kṛt* and *taddhita*, any division is unsatisfactory.

KṚT

UNWARRANTED PRESUMPTION

NON-RECOGNITION

MISINTERPRETATION

UN-PĀṆINIAN USAGES

LACK OF UNIFORMITY

MISCELLANEOUS

The draw-backs in this section of the grammar may be summarised as follows :

20. UNWARRANTED PRESUMPTION

In a good number of cases there are no *kṛt* suffixes added, but some or other *kṛt* suffix is admitted in each of these cases. Such are :

(i) words ending in the roots—*sad-*, *sū-*, *dviṣ-*, *druh-*, *yuj-*, *vid-*, *bhid-*, *chid-*, *nī-*, *rāj-*[1], *han-*[2]. Examples :—*sabhā-sad*, *vīra-sū*, *mitra-dviṣ*, *mitra-druh*, *go-duh*, *aśva-yuj*, *Brahma-vid*, *Gotra-bhid*, *rajju-cchid*, *senā-nī*, *sam-rāj*, *Vṛtra-han*.

In all these a suffix *kvip* is admitted.

(ii) The words—*diś*, *prāñc*, *pratyañc*, *udañc*, *tiryañc*, *yuj*, *sraj*, *ghṛta-spṛś* (etc.), *yādṛś*, *tādṛś* (etc.).[3]

Here the suffix admitted is *-kvin*.

(iii) Words ending in the roots *dā-*, *dhā-* : *upa-dā*, *upa-dhā*, *antar-dhā*, *pra-dhā*, *śrad-dhā*.

The suffix *-aṅ* (+ fem. suff. *ā*) is admitted here.[4]

In the above words no suffix is visible. Here a root, either compounded with a preceding element or alone, is used as noun (or adj.). Whitney calls them *root-words, root-stems, stems without suffix, having in them no demonstrable element added to a root.*[5] Prof. Burrow has given them the name *root-nouns.*[6]

The non-visibility of the suffix in the case of *-kvip* and *-kvin* is held in Pāṇini to be due to their elision, and in the case of *—aṅ* (=*a*) it is due to merger with the radical *ā*. But it is unnecessary to admit suffixes which are only to be elided or admitted as merged.

The real reason behind such assumption of suffixes seems to be that the use of verbal roots as nouns was not considered possible by Pāṇini (or

---

[1] *sat-sū-dviṣ-druha-duha-yuja-vida-bhida-cehida-ji-nī-rājām upasarge'pi kvip*, Pāṇ. 3.2.61.

[2] *brahma-bhrūṇa-vṛtreṣu kvip*, ibid. 3.2.87.

[3] *ṛtvig-dadhṛk-srag.....* ; *tyadādiṣu dṛśo' nālocane kañ ca.*,ibid. 3.2.59-60.

[4] *ātaścopasarge* with *Vārt.* : *śrad-antaror-upasargavad vṛttiḥ*, Pāṇ. 3.3.106.

[5] Whitney's *Sans. Gram.*, paras 323, 348ff., 383ff., 400, 401, 1147.

[6] T. Burrow—*Sans. Lang.* p. 122. Burrow has mentioned only the uncompounded roots.

any other ancient grammarian). Hence a suffix of no practical value was admitted in such cases. Actually, however, these are root-words without any suffix.

In this connection Pāṇini's admission of Uṇādi affixes[1] also cannot go unnoticed. Actually most of these suffixes cannot be recognised, for they do not give any satisfactory derivation of the words where they are supposed to occur.[2] Such suffixes are admitted by Pāṇini as well as his predecessors Yāska and Śākaṭāyana only to prove the theory of verbal origin of all nouns.[3] But it has already been pointed out[4] that at most only the pure Sanskrit words, i.e., words which are not borrowed from external sources, can have such origin, and the rest must be regarded underivable from Sanskrit roots and suffixes. Even the great Patañjali has withheld his support from this theory.[5] Thus the admission of Uṇādi too becomes an unwarranted presumption.

21. NON-RECOGNITION

Some suffixes have not received due recognition in Pāṇini. They are: (i) *-ka, -na, -ma, -la, -va* used as past participle suffixes with some roots.[6] In Pāṇini they are not suffixes, but substitutes for *-kta* which is considered to be the real suffix.

But that these are suffixes has been admitted elsewhere: *-ka* is admitted as a *taddhita* (with *samāsānta* use also); *-na* as a *kṛt* (cf. *yat-na, svap-na* etc.), *taddhita* (cf. *strai-ṇa*) and *vi-karaṇa* (cf. *bhi-na-tti*); *-ma* as a

---

1 Vide *uṇādayo bahulam*, Pāṇ. 3.3.1.

2 e.g. *biḍāla* from √*biḍi*+*kālan*; *kulāla* from √*kuli*+*kālan*, in which the roots √*biḍi* and √*kuli* are purely imaginary; *dīnara* from √*dīṅ*+*nuṭ*+*āran*, though the word is obviously from Gk. *denarius*. (Vide SED).

3 *nāma ca dhātu-jam āha nirukte*
vyākaraṇe Śakaṭasya ca tokam. (Vārt. on Pāṇ. 3.3.1.).

4 Vide Chapter I.

5 Patañjali has clearly declared that the *Uṇādi*-derivatives are actually underivable words: *Uṇādayo' vyutpannāni prātipadikāni* (Bhāṣya on Pāṇ. 1.1.61, Vārt. 4). Kātyāyana, too, seems to hold the same view, for he says *Uṇādi* words are *naigama-rūḍhibhavam* i.e., Vedic and automatically grown. (Vide Vārt. 4 on Pāṇ. 3.3.1).

6 *-ka* with *śuṣ-*; *-ma* with *kṣai-, styā-*; *-la* with *phul-*; *-va* with *pac-*; and *-na* with a number of roots. (Vide Pāṇ. 8.2. 42-60 : *ra-dābhyāṁ niṣṭhāto naḥ pūrvasya ca daḥ*, etc.).

taddhita (cf. *pañca-ma* etc.) ; *-la* as a *taddhita* (cf. *vatsa-la*, *phena-la* etc.) ; and *-va* also as a *taddhita* (cf. *Keśa-va*).[1]

Therefore they can be accepted as suffixes here too. It cannot be said that they are used rarely, and therefore they are rather to be treated as substitutes for *-kta* which is widely used. All suffixes cannot be equally popular, and for not being so should not be excluded from the list of suffixes. Neither has such exclusion been made elsewhere. For example, a *taddhita* suffix *-va* is admitted though it is seen only in three words.[2] It is not treated as a substitute for *-matup* which is the widely used suffix in this case. Besides, -at least *-na* is not a rarely added thing. It is taken by about seventy roots.[3] It is found in other Indo-European languages too[4]; cf. Skt. *pūr-ṇa*, L. *ple-nu-s*, Lith. *pil-na-s*, OBul. *plu-nu*, Av. *pare-na*. Also cf. Skt. *śuṣ-ka*, L. *sic-cu-s for* IE. suff. *-ka*.

-na, etc., therefore, deserve recognition as suffixes (not substitutes) by the side of *-kta*.

(ii) *-ā* as in *bhāṣ-ā*, *sev-ā*, *hiṁs-ā* etc. In such cases a suffix *-a*[5] is admitted ; but since this vowel, together with the root-final, cannot result in the long final vowel of the derivatives (*e.g. bhāṣ* - + *a* = *bhāṣ-a*), the fem. suff. *-ā* is then added (*bhāṣ-* + *a* + *ā*=*bhāṣā*). But there is no necessity of a feminine suffix here. An action noun can be of any gender ; e.g. *gamanam* (neut.), *gati* (fem.), *ā-gama* (masc.). With the suffix *-a* the words in question could as well be *bhāṣ-a*, *sev-a* etc., and there the fem. suff. *-ā* would not be a desideratum. Therefore the *-ā* here must be regarded as a necessary suffix, not an unnecessary fem. suffix. When *-ā* is accepted as necessary in the formations, the further admission of the suffix *-a* becomes unnecessary (*bhāṣ-* + *ā* = *bhāṣā*). Thus *-ā* remains the only suffix in such cases. Here it functions as *kṛt*, but usually it makes feminines.[6]

---

[1] *keśād vo'nyatarasyām*, Pāṇ. 5.2.109 ; also vide the next sūtra (5.2.110 : *gāṇḍi-ajagāt saṁjñāyām*).

[2] *keśa-va*, *gāṇḍī-va*,*ajaga-va*; *keśād vo'nyatarasyām* : *gāṇḍī-ajagāt saṁjñāyām*, Pāṇ. 5.2.109-110.

[3] Whitney's *Sans. Gram.* para. 957 ; T. Burrow – *Sans. Lang.* p. 150.

[4] "This suffix also is paralleled elsewhere in Indo-European."
—Burrow (p. 369).

[5] *a pratyayāt* ; *guroś ca halaḥ*, Pāṇ. 3.3. 102-103.

[6] For its other uses vide chapter IV. Here Prof. T. Burrow says : "The suffix *-ā* has two functions. On the one hand it forms the feminine of adjectives in *-a*.....and on the other it appears as an indepen-

(iii) *-t* (as in *śatru-ji-t, śastra-bhṛ-t, pāpa-kṛ-t* etc.)

In such cases the suffix admitted is *-kvip* which disappears leaving nothing behind. Therefore the *-t* cannot be an effect of this suffix.[1] The *-t* is the real and only suffix here, which fact is obvious. For no other element is noticed after the root. *-t* as a suffix forms the 3rd person sing. of imperfect and aorist active; e.g. *a-yā-t, a-bhū-t* etc. It forms also the ablative sing. and plur. of *asmad* and *yusmad* (*ma-t, asma-t, tva-t, yuṣma-t*). Therefore there is no reason why it should not be accepted as a suffix here.

(iv) *-tya* (as in *vi-ji-tya, pra-hṛ-tya* etc.) This is interpreted as an augment *tuk* (*t*) + *-lyap* (*ya*). But *-tya* may be accepted as a simple indivisible suffix. For there is the suffix *-tvā* (also *-tvī, -tvāya* in Veda) in the same function, which too begins with *t*, but that *t* is not claimed to be an augment. *-tya* is quite in unison with *-tvā, -tvī, -tvāya*, and need not be split into an augment and a suffix. The suff. *-ya* (Pāṇinian *-lyap*) is most probably a decayed form of *-tya*.

-tya as a suffix is admitted elsewhere (e.g., *pāścāt-tya, amā-tya, tatra-tya* etc.).[2] This also accounts for *kṛ-tya, bhṛ-tya, stu-tya* etc.[3] Hence it is admissible in the gerunds *vi-ji-tya* etc.

It is noticeable that though the same suffix[4] (*-tya*) is responsible for all the above formations, three different suffixes plus the augment *t* (*tuk*) are admitted in Pāṇini: (*a*) *-tya* in *pāścāt-tya* etc.; (*b*) *-kyap* (+*tuk*) in *kṛ-tya* etc.; and *-lyap* (+*tuk*) in *vi-ji- tya* etc.

22. MISINTERPRETATION

Several adverbially used case-forms have been taken for derivatives of *kṛt* suffixes.[5] These are:

(i) *-ṇamul-* derivatives—*veda-m, jīva-m, ghāta-m* (as in *jighāṁsu-veda-m, yāvaj-jīva-m, samūla-ghāta-m* etc.) Actually these are the accusative singular forms of *veda, ghāta* etc. But in Pāṇini a *kṛt* suffix *-ṇamul* is assumed

---

dent suffix of derivation, producing action nouns, abstract nouns, and the like." (*Sans. Lang.* p. 190).

[1] In Pāṇini *-t* is supposed to be an augment due to the suff. *-kvip* (*hrasvasya piti kṛiti tuk*, Pāṇ. 6.1.71)

[2] *dakṣiṇā-paścāt-purasas-tyak*; *avyayāt tyap*, Pāṇ. 4.2.98, 104.

[3] *eti-stu--śās-vṛ-dṛ-juṣaḥ kyap*; *bhṛño 'saṁjñāyām*; *kṛñaḥśa ca*, ibid. 3.1.109, 112; 3.3.100.

[4] For the unity or classlessness of suffixes vide chapter IV.

[5] Also of *taddhita* suffixes. Vide the chapter on *Taddhita*.

to account for them (*yāvat-jīv-* + *ṇamul*=*yāvaj-jīva-m* etc.). This is unnecessary. *veda, jīva* etc. are elsewhere regarded as derivatives of the suffix *-a* (*-ac, -ap, -ghañ* etc.). A different etymology cannot be proposed here.

Besides, the use of the accusative as adverb is well established in Sanskrit in such sentences as *sukhaṁ svap-i-ti, duḥkham ās-te, dru-taṁ dhāv -a-ti* etc. Also cf. *kāma-ṁ priyā na su-labhā ; taiḥ pra-kāmaṁ bhuk-tam* etc., where too the same thing has happened.

So there cannot be any objection to admitting adverbial use of accusative in *-vedam, -ghātam* etc.

(ii) Infinitives—The Infinitives in Sanskrit are said to be formed by the suffixes *-tum* (in *gan-tum, kar-tum* etc.), *-se, -sen, -ase, -asen, -kse, -ksen, -adhyai, -adhyain, -kadhyai, -kadhyain, -śadhyai, -śadhyain, -tavai, -taveṅ, -taven, -tosun, and -kasun,*[1] the suffixes from *-se* to *-kasun* being found in Veda only.

But actually the infinitives are formed otherwise, not with these suffixes. They are all case-forms usually accusative and dative.

(*a*) The so-called *-tum*-infinitive is accusative singular of verbal nouns in *-tu ; kartum*=*kar-tu-m*, i.e, acc. sing. of *kartu* (<*kṛ-* +*tu*). For this suffix (*-tu*) cf. Skt. *gā-tu, pi-tu, ṛtu ;* Gk. *kra-tu-s, kra-to-s* (= Skt. *kra-tu*) ; L. *sta-tu-s* (= Skt. *sthā-tu* as in *sthātu-m*). The meaning, too is that of the verbal noun : *gan-tu-m icchāmi*=*gamanam icchāmi*=I want going (i.e., to go).

(*b*) The Infinitives in *-tave* etc. are almost all dative cases of verbal nouns with or without a suffix . For example, *kartave* is the dat. sing. from *kar-tu.* The suffix involved is *-tu,* not *-tave* ; *dṛśe* is the dat. sing. of *dṛś* (=the root *dṛś-* used as verbal noun without a suffix).

In this way Sanskrit Infinitives are all case-forms having nothing to do with the suffixes *-tum, -tave* etc.

23. UN-PĀṆINIAN USAGES

The rules regarding the uses of some suffixes are often violated in literature, and sometimes they are inadequate. This will be clear from the following :

(i) *-ktvā, -lyap*

[1] *tumun-ṇvulau kriyāyāṁ kriyārthāyām ; samāna-kartṛkeṣu tumun ; tumarthe se-sen-ase-asen-kse-ksen-adhyai..... tavai-taveṅ.....; īśvare tosun-kasunau.* Pāṇ. 3.3.10, 158 ; 3.4. 9-11, 13.

A. Violations :

(*a*) *samāna-kartṛka-tva*[1] is a condition for the use of these suffixes. But this condition is often violated ; e.g. :

taṁ ha enaṁ dṛṣṭvā bhīr viveda ; —Ś.Br[2].

raso'pyasya paraṁ dṛṣ-ṭvā ni-vartate ; —G[3].

tato me punar evāsīt
saṁ-jñā sañ-cint-ya śāstra-taḥ. —MBh[4].

krī-tvā vi-krī-ya vā kiñ-cid
yasyehānu-śayo bhavet. —Ag -P[5].

Usually such cases are regularised by assuming an understood *sthitasya*. Thus *raso'pyasya* etc. is supposed to be for *raso'pyasya paraṁ dṛṣṭvā sthitasya ni-vartate*, where *samāna-kartṛkatva* is there between *dṛṣṭvā* and *sthitasya*.

But such an assumption is not necessary for the understanding of the sense. The sense is clear from the expressed words themselves. No other word is required for that. In *kasmāt tvam* ? —the sense is not complete and therefore another word *ā-gataḥ* is to be supplied there. Not so in the present case. Hence nothing can be assumed understood. Had such a word been understood, how is it that no writer ever stated it expressly ? By the side of *kasmāt tvam* ? —there is also the expression *kasmād ā-gato'si* ?

The conclusion is that the above cases are without *samāna-kartṛka-tva*, and even then these are clear expressions with *-ktvā,-lyap*. Therefore the above violations of the rule need not be blamed. Rather the rule requires amendment in the light of them.

It may be said that as compounds like *Devadattasya guru-putraḥ* are allowed by *sāpekṣatve'pi gamakatvāt samāsaḥ*, so the above sentences are to be accepted as correct by an *asamāna-kartṛkatve'pi gamakatvāt*. Actually, *samāna-kartṛkatva* is to be insisted upon where the sense is not otherwise clear.

(*b*) Another condition— *-ktvā* with uncompounded roots and *-lyap* with roots compounded with prepositions—is violated in the following cases :

---

[1] *samāna-kartṛkayoḥ pūrva-kāle*, Pāṇ. 3.4.21.

[2] Whitney's Sans. gram., para 994 c.

[3] G. 2.59.

[4] MBh., Anuśāsanaparvan, 84.17.

[5] AgP. 227.13.

(1) *-ktvā* for *-lyap*—

namas-kṛ-tvā tu sa prāha
Devadevāya Su-vrata. —MBh.[1]

prekṣayi-tvā bhuvo golam patnyai —Bhāg.[2]

viprān sam-pūjayi-tvā tu
mandāraṁ prāśayen niśi. —Matsy-P.[3]

vi-ji-tvā tu yathā-nyāyaṁ
tato bandham sam-ā-caret. —Ag. P.[4]

There are many more quotable.[5]

(2) *-lyap* for *-ktvā*—

Aśoke vi-male tīrthe
snā-tvā vai tarp-ya devatāḥ. —MBh.[6]

Veda-nāvam imāṁ gṛh-ya. —Matsy[7]

Yaśodā bālikāṁ gṛh-ya
Devakī-śayane 'nayat. —Ag. ρ[8]

devīṁ pañcāmṛtaiḥ snāp-ya
pūjayec cārhaṇādinā. —ibid.[9]

More may be quoted.[10]

These violations in the early literature[11] indicates that the rule laid down by Pāṇini was not authenticated by ancient tradition which appears to have allowed optional use of *-ktvā* and *-lyap* according to convenience. Even the later language has retained, in one case, the use of *-ktvā* with compounded roots (only with *nañ-* or *a-*), and optional use of both suffixes

---

[1] MBh. Anuśāsanaparvan, 15.10.
[2] Bhāg. 3.23.43.
[3] Matsy-P. 78.3.
[4] Ag.P. 251.7.
[5] Vide Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, para 990a.
[6] MBh. Anuśāsanaparvan, 19.27.
[7] Matsy-P. 2.10.
[8] Ag-P. 12.4.
[9] i.e. Ag-P. 185.15.
[30] See Whitney's Grammar, para 990a.
[11] including Veda.

with *ava-dhīr-* (*ava-dhīr-ya, ava-dhīrayi-tvā*). This is doubtless handed down from the old wider practice in this regard, which Pāṇini stemmed.

B. Inadequacy :

These suffixes sometimes express cause, condition and the sense of a participial preposition (*barring, regarding* etc.). This has not been noted in Pāṇini. Examples are :

(*a*) Cause—

raso'pyasya paraṁ dṛṣṭvā ni-vartate

—G.[1]

tatra snātvā naro bhaktyā
bhrājate bhāskaro yathā.

—Sk. ρ[2], Kāśī.

Gaṅgādiṣu ca tīrtheṣu
snātvā yat phalam āp-yate.

—Padma. ρ[3]

yaḥ kaścit tu haret pretam
a-sa-piṇḍaṁ kathañcana.
snātvā sa-celaḥ spṛṣṭvā 'gniṁ
ghṛtaṁ prāś-ya vi-śudhyati.

—Ag. ρ[4]

In Veda too : *pitvī somasya vavṛdhe* (RV.), *taṁ hainaṁ dṛṣṭvā bhīr viveda* (ŚBr.) etc.[5]

In these sentences *dṛṣṭvā, snātvā, spṛṣṭvā* etc. express not only a preceding action, but one causally connected with the subsequent actions. *paraṁ dṛṣṭvā ni-vartate*=recedes *owing to seeing* the Supreme Being ; *snātvā vi-śudhyati* = achieves purity *owing to bathing* ; and so on.

(*b*) Condition—

a-mānuṣīṣu puruṣa
udakyāyām a-yoniṣu,
retaḥ siktvā jale caiva
kṛcchraṁ sāntapanaṁ caret.

—Ag. ρ[6]

---

[1] G. 2.59.
[2] Sk-P. Kāśīkhaṇḍa, 15.67.
[3] Padma-P. 4.15.20.
[4] Ag-P. 158.44.
[5] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 994c.
[6] Ag-P. 169.36.

Here *siktvā* means 'if one emits', not 'after emitting', for in that case the sense comes that such emission is being prescribed, which is undesirable.

(c) Preposition—*muktvā, varjayitvā, adhi-kṛ-tya* etc.[1] have acquired a prepositional value in the following:

Mahādevasya devo' nyaḥ
ko nāmaḥ sa-dṛśo bhavet.
muktvā Cakrāyudhaṁdevaṁ.....

—Ag. P[2]

ko nu man-māyayā guptāṁ
vāpīm amṛta-toyinīm,
pāsyate Viṣṇum ajitaṁ
varjayitvā Gadādharam.

—ibid.[3]

Rāmam adhi-kṛ-tya kṛ-to granthaḥ.

In such cases *muktvā* and *varjayitvā* means 'except, excepting, barring'; *adhi-kṛ-tya* means 'about'

(ii) *-tumun*—

By the rule *samāna-kartṛkeṣu tumun*[4], *samāna-kartṛkatva* is required in the use of this suffix too. But this is violated in the following examples:

nandāmi saumya bhadraṁ te
yo māṁ jīvi-tum icchasi.

—MBh.[5]

prajāsu vṛttiṁ yam a-yuṅkta veditum.

—Kirāt.[6]

sukham artho bhaved dātuṁ
sukhaṁ prāṇāḥ sukhaṁ tapaḥ.
sukham anyad bhavet sarvaṁ
duḥkhaṁ nyāsasya rakṣaṇam.

—Svap.[7]

śatrūn yoddhuṁ sainyaṁ prāhiṇot.

—Monier Williams[8]

---

[1] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 994 g.
[2] Ag-P. 132.50.
[3] ibid. 135.16.
[4] Pāṇ. 3.3.158.
[5] MBh. Śāntiparvan, 128.67.
[6] Kirāt 1.1.
[7] Svap. 1.10.
[8] Vide his *Practical Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 374. The source, if any, is not stated there.

vanaṁ gantuṁ dhenuṁ mumoca,
pitaraṁ draṣṭuṁ bālaṁ preritavān etc.[4]

Such cases are defended by saying that *samāna-kartṛkatva* is necessary only if the finite verb has the sense of *wish*. In connection with other finite verbs that is not necessary. The reply is that (i) this interpretation has not the sanction of the Mahā-bhāṣya, there being no *bhāṣya* at all on this sūtra.[1] (2) In the other sūtra for the use of *-tumun* (*tumunṇvulau kriyāyāṁ kriyārthāyām*)[2] there is no mention (or *anu-vṛtti*) of *icchārtheṣu*, whence it becomes clear that all roots as finite verbs are concerned there. But it has not been stated anywhere that *samāna-kartṛkatva* is not necessary there. The examples given are those with *samāna-kartṛkatva*. This indicates *samāna-kartṛkatva* is necessary for *-tumun* in every case.

samāna-kartṛkatva being thus a necessity for *-tumun*, the above examples are violations of this condition.

(3) Even if *samāna-kartṛkatva* be necessary only with roots meaning 'wish', still the rule is violated in *yo māṁ jīvitum icchasi* etc. quoted above.

Thus whatever interpretation of the sūtra (*samāna-kartṛkeṣu tumun*) is adopted the rule is seen violated.

By *kāla-samaya-velāsu tumun*[1] (*-tumun* occurs in connection with *kāla* (time) etc.) Pāṇini has clearly allowed *a-samāna-kartṛkatva* with *-tumun* in a number of cases. Therefore insistence on *samāna-kartṛkatva* elsewhere also is not possible to any great extent.

The principle seems acceptable—*a-samāna-kartṛkatve'pi gamakatvāt* (*tumun*)—as a supplementary to the rule (*samāna-kartṛkeṣu tumun*), that is, *-tum* is possible even in the absence of *samāna-kartṛkatva*, if the sense is quite clear.

24. LACK OF UNIFORMITY

Most of the suffixes in Pāṇini have more than one name, while the real names are scarcely to be found. This involves some difficulties. The cases in the *kṛt* section of the grammar are noted below :

---

[4] U. N. Vidyabhusan—*Manual of Higher Sanskrit Grammar and Composition.*

[1] *samāna-kartṛkeṣu tumun*, Pāṇ. 3.3.158.

[2] ibid. 3.3.10.

[1] ibid. 3.3.167.

real suffixes	Pāṇinian names
(i) *-a*	*-ac*[1]
	-aṇ[2]
	-ap[3]
	-ka[4]
	-kañ[5]
	-khac[6]
	-khal[7]
	-khas[8]
	-gha[9]
	-ghañ[10]
	-ṭa[11]
	-ṭak[12]
	-ḍa[13]
	-ṇac[14]
	-śa[15]
(ii) *-aka*	*-ṇvul*[16]
	-vuñ[17]
	-vun[18]
	-ṣvun[10]

1 Pāṇ.3.1.134 ; 3.2. 9-15 ; 3.3.56 ; 3.4.73.
2 ibid. 3.2. 1-2, 44.
3 ibid 3.3.57-87.
4 ibid 3.1. 135-136, 144 ; 3.2. 3-7.
-ka may not be accepted as a suffix in most of the cases: for it adds nothing there.
5 ibid. 3.2.60.
6 ibid. 3.2. 38-47.
7 ibid. 3.3. 126-127.
8 ibid. 3.2. 28-36.
9 ibid. 3.3. 118-119, 125.
10 ibid. 3.3. 16-125.
11 ibid. 3.2. 16-23.
12 ibid. 3.2.8, 52-54.
13 ibid. 3.2. 48-50, 97-101 ; *-ḍa* may not be accepted as a suffix, for it adds nothing.
14 ibid. 3.3.43.
15 ibid. 3.1. 137-139.
16 ibid. 3.1. 133 ; 3.3.10.
17 ibid. 3.2. 146-147.
18 ibid. 3.1. 149-150.
19 ibid. 3.1.145.

real suffixes	Pāṇinian names
(iii) *-ana*	*-khyun*[1]
	-ñyuṭ[2]
	-yuc[3]
	-lyu[4]
	-lyuṭ[5]
(iv) *-āna*	*-kānac*[6]
	-cānaś[7]
	-śānac[8]
	-śānan[9]
(v) *-i*	*-in*[10]
	-ki[11]
	-kin[12]
(vi) *-in*	*-ini*[13]
	-ghinuṇ[14]
	-ṇini[15]
(vii) *-iṣṇu*	*-iṣṇuc*[16]
	-khiṣṇuc[17]
(viii) *-uka*	*-ukañ*[18]
	-khukañ[19]

[1] ibid. 3.2.56.
[2] ibid. 3.2. 65-66.
[3] ibid. 3.2. 148-153 ; 3.3. 128-130.
[4] ibid. 3.1.134.
[5] ibid. 3.3. 113, 115-117.
[6] ibid. 3.2.106.
[7] ibid. 3.2.129.
[8] ibid. 3.2.124-126.
[9] ibid. 3.2.128.
[10] ibid. 3.2.24-27.
[11] ibid. 3.2.171 ; 3.3.92-93.
[12] ibid. 3.2.171.
[13] ibid. 3.2.93, 156-157.
[14] ibid. 3.2.141-145.
[15] ibid. 3.1.134 ; 3.2.51, 78-86.
[16] ibid. 3.2.136-138.
[17] ibid. 3.2.57.
[18] ibid. 3.2.154.
[19] ibid. 3.2.57.

real suffixes	Pāṇinian names
(ix) *-ura*	*-kurac*[1]
	-ghurac[2]
(x) *-tavya*	*-tavya*[3]
	-tavyat[4]
(xi) *-tṛ*	*-tṛc*[5]
	-tṛṇ[6]
	-ṣṭran[7]
(xii) *-tya*	*-kyap*[8]
	-lyap[9]
(xiii) *-na*	*-kta*[10]
	-naṅ[11]
	-nan[12]
(xiv) *-ya*	*-kyap*[13]
	-khaś[14]
	-ṇyat[15]
	-yat[16]
	-śa[17]
(xv) *-ru*	*-kru*[18]
	-ru[19]

[1] ibid. 3.2.162.
[2] ibid. 3.2.161.
[3] ibid. 3.1.96.
[4] ibid. 3.1.96.
[5] ibid. 3.1.133.
[6] ibid. 3.2.135.
[7] ibid. 3.2.181.
[8] ibid. 3.1.108-109, 112 ; 3.3.100.
[9] ibid. 7.1.37.
[10] ibid. 8.2.42-60.
[11] ibid. 3.3.90.
[12] ibid. 3.3.91.
[13] ibid. 3.1.106-123 ; 3.3.98-99.
[14] ibid. 3.2. 36-37, 83.
[15] ibid. 3.1. 122-129.
[16] ibid. 3.1. 97-106.
[17] ibid. 3.3.100 ; also Vārt. on 3.3.101.
[18] ibid. 3.2.174.
[19] ibid. 3.2.159.

real suffixes	Pāṇinian names
(xvi) *-van*	*-kvanip*,
	-vanip[1]
	-ḍvanip[2]
(xvii) *-vara*	*-kvarap*[3]
	-varac[4]
(xviii) *-vas*	*-kvasu*[5]
	-śatṛ[6]

What a variety of names is given to some suffixes will be clear from the above list.

The difficulties that arise from such naming are : (i) Words of same derivation are kept apart, which is a big handicap in the path of quick understanding of etymology. But for this system one could easily say that *pāk-a, jay-a, harṣ-a, su-kara, priyaṁ-vad-a, abhraṁ-lih-a, Kuru-car-a* have the same suffix in them ; so also *gam-ana, nand-ana, sudarś-ana, su-bhagaṁ-kar-aṇa, havya-vāh-ana ; bhṛ-tya, kṛ-tya, ā-ga-tya* etc. In the Pāṇinian system these words appear unrelated, and a lot of trouble is required to learn their suffixes. (ii) Sometimes this affords scope for violating a rule. For example, the construction *kaṭasya kartā*, though prohibited by *na lokāvyaya* etc.[7] is available, if the suffix in *kartā* is regarded as *-tṛc* (not *-tṛn*), which is not a prohibited suffix in the matter of *ṣaṣṭhī*. Thus the prohibition with regard to *-tṛn* fails, and this is due to a different name of the same suffix. It cannot be said that *-tṛn* or *-tṛc* can be known from the difference of accent, for classical Sanskrit is not written with accent marks. Therefore the problem is unavoidable at least in this part of the language.

Similarly the rule *pūraṇa-guṇa* etc.[8] prohibiting *ṣaṣṭhī-samāsa* with words in *-tavya* can be violated and the compound *Brāhmṇa-kartavya* made available saying that the suffix is *-tavyat*, not *-tavya*.

(iii) This unnecessarily increases the number of suffixes. Whereas the actual number of suffixes is small, this has raised the figure at least to three times. This is not conducive to the study of Sanskrit grammar.

1 ibid. 3.2. 74-75, 94-96.
2 ibid. 3.2.103.
3 ibid. 3.2. 163-164.
4 ibid. 3.2. 175-176.
5 ibid. 3.2. 107-109.
6 ibid. 7.1.36.
7 ibid. 2.3.69.
8 ibid. 2.2.11.

25. MISCELLANEOUS

(i) *jala-da, pāda-pa* etc.[1]

In such cases a suffix *-ka* (= *-a*) is admitted (*jala-dā-* + *a* etc.) This is unnecessary. The forms are obviously derived by shortening of the radical vowel (*jala-dā* > *da*). This is an internal change without anything external added. Hence there is no question of a suffix. The shortening is certainly with a view to getting an *a*-stem which is the commonest in use. Time was when even unshortened forms were in use; cf. *Viśva-pā, go-pā, bala-dā* etc. But these have met with general disapproval since then, and now they are avoided in favour of the shortened forms. The very existence of the unshortened forms is evidence enough of the absence of suffix in the other forms. The shortening is for convenience from the original form in *-ā*

(ii) *saro-ja, buddhi-ja etc.*[2]

In such cases the suffix *-ḍa* (= *-a*) is admitted. But not the addition of suffix but dropping of a portion of the stem has given rise to these forms: *saro-jan-* > *ja*. The elision is that of the stem-final *n*. If by addition of something a new form can be achieved, why not by dropping something from the original? A statue can be made by joining parts as well as by cutting out parts (as in sculpture). Therefore no suffix need be admitted here.

Addition (of suffix), elision (of portion of stem), shortening or other change of the stem-vowel or doing nothing at all (as in *sabhā-sad, senā-nī* etc. noted under section 20 above)—all these are devices for making derivatives. But only one i.e., addition of suffix has been recognised in Pāṇini.

(iii) *vi-dhi, jala-dhi etc.*[3]

Here a suffix *-ki* (= *-i*) is admitted. But the change of *dā-, dhā-* to *dī- dhī-* is noticed even without this suffix; cf. *a-di-ta, a-di-ṣātām, a-di-ṣata; a-dhi-ta, a-dhi-ṣātām, a-dhi-ṣata; dī-yate, dhī-yate;* also *(d)hi-ta.* Hence *-ki* cannot be held responsible for this change in *vi-dhi* etc. too.

The roots *dā-* and *dhā-*, as also other roots in *ā* (*pā-, hā, sthā- etc.*), have a tendency to change their vowel (*ā*) to *ī* frequently; cf. *pā-* > *pī-yate, pī-ta, pi-bati; sthā-* > *sthī-yate, sthi-ta* etc. Therefore it is unnecessary to assume a suffix *-ki* to account for this change in *vi-dhi* etc.

---

[1] *āto 'nupasarage kaḥ* ; *supi sthaḥ*, Pāṇ. 3.2. 3-4.

[2] *saptamyām janer ḍaḥ* ; *pañcamyām ajātau*, ibid. 3.2. 97-98.

[3] *upasarge ghoḥ kiḥ* ; *karmaṇyadhikaraṇe ca*, ibid. 3.3. 92-93.

Here the modified form of the roots has been used. Sometimes the root is found in its original form ; cf. *upa-dhā, vi-dhā, san-dhā,* Hence the question of suffix does not arise. Here Whitney's remark is noteworthy :

> "Opinions are at variance as to whether such forms are to be regarded as made with the suffix *i*, displacing the radical *ā*, or with weakening of *ā* to *i*".[1]

---

[1] Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, para 1155 g.

TADDHITA

UNWARRANTED PRESUMPTION:

NO VISIBLE SUFFIX

VOWEL-CHANGE TAKEN FOR SUFFIX

LAKṢAṆĀ MISINTERERETED

CASE-ENDINGS MISINTERPRETED

COMPOUNDS NOT NOTED

COMPOUND-CUM-IRONY MISSED

ELISION MISINTERPRETED

REPETITION

TADDHITA SUFFIX VS. SAMĀSA

LACK OF UNIFORMITY

MISCELLANEOUS

26. UNWARRANTED PRESUMPTION:

A vulnerable point in this section of the grammar is the inclusion of a large number of words with no palpable suffix (*taddhita*). But some or other *taddhita* suffix is pointed out in them. These are:

(i) Words with initial vowel-change only:—*Śaiva* (< *Śiva*), *Autsa* (< *Utsa*), *Vaida* (< *Vida*), *Sāṅkala* (< *Saṅkala*), *Vāsudeva* (< *Vasudeva*), *Bhārata* (< *Bharata*), *paiśāca* (< *piśāca*), *chātra* (< *chatra*), *Vaideha* (< *Videha*), *māyūra* (< *mayūra*), *daiva* (< *deva*) *etc.*

In such words the suffixes *-añ*, *-aṇ* and *-ṇa* are admitted.[1]

(ii) Words with vowel-change at the end or changed final vowel:—

amāvāsya (< *amāvāsyā*), *rāṣṭra-pata*, *kiṁ-sakha*, *puṣkarākṣa*, *dyaṅgula*, *aho-rātra*, *rāja-sakha*, *mṛga-saktha*, *dyañjala*, *upa-nada*, *upa-gira*, *dirgha-saktha*, *pañcāṅgula*, *śāri-kukṣa*, *caturasra*, *su-saktha*, *su-gandhi*, *dvi-tra*, *kṛṣṇa-bhūma*, *pañca-nada*, *padma-nābha* etc.

The suffixes admitted here are: *-a*, *-ac*, *-aṇ*, *-it*, *-ṭac*, *-ḍac*, *-ṣac*.[2]

(iii) Words with vowel-change at both ends:—

āśva-pata, *Dāśa-rathi*, *Airāvata*, *kaumbha-kāri*, *bhaikṣa*, *bhauma*, *māgha*, *saubhadra*, *saikata* etc.

The suffixes found here are: *-añ*, *-aṇ*, *-iñ*.[3]

(iv) Words with no change at all:—

Aṅgāḥ, *Vaṅgāḥ*, *Gargāḥ*, *Yudhiṣṭhirāḥ*, *Cola*, *Śaka*, *Yavana*, *Avantī*, *dvi-veda*, *tri-veda*, *Punar-vasu*, *go-sthāna*, *Vāsavadattā*, *Kādambarī*, *sukha*, *kalyāṇa*, *catur*, *a-śakta*, *priya-dharman*, *śārṅga-dhanvan*, *dvi-varṣa*, *lavaṇa* etc.

---

[1] Vide Pāṇ. 4.1.86, 104, 112, 114, 170; 4.2.1, 37, 38, 59, 73-75; 4.3.1, 53, 101, 120; 4.4.62; 5.4.36, 38; *utsādibhyo'ñ*; *śivādibhyo'ṇ*; *chatrādibhyo ṇaḥ*; etc.

[2] Pāṇ. 4.1.84; 4.3.31; 5.4.73, 75,76, 86,87, 91, 98, 102, 110, 112-114, 120,121, 135-137; also Vārt. on 5.4.75: *aśva-patyādibhyaś ca*; *a ca*; *bahuvrīhau saṁkhyeye ḍaj a-bahu-gaṇāt*; *akṣṇo'darśanāt*; etc.

[3] Pāṇ. 4.1.84, 95,96, 113, 117, 153, 173; 4.2.3, 38, 56, 75: *aśvapatyādibhyaś ca*; *ata iñ*; *bāhvādibhyaś ca*; *śivādibhyo'ṇ*; etc.

In words like these, a suffix usually of the value of *-a* is admitted; also admitted is the elision of the same suffix[1]; but in spite of the admission of elision, they are not regarded us totally suffixless. In derivations the suffix concerned is shown; e.g. *lavaṇa* (salty) = *lavaṇa* (salt)+*ṭhak*, which is elided by *lavaṇāl luk*.[2]

(v) Adverbially used case-forms :—

uttareṇa, dakṣiṇeṇa, adhareṇa, uttarāt, dakṣiṇāt, adharāt, uttarā, dakṣiṇā, paścā, paścāt, purastāt, adhastāt, avastāt, avarastāt.

Here the suffixes *-enap, -āti, -āe, -astāti* are admitted.[3]

(vi) Compounds with the following words as final member :—

maha, grāma, khaṇḍa, kāṅḍa, skandha, vidha, bhakta, pāśa, rūpa, rūpya, kalpa, deśya, deśīya, mātra, taila, goṣṭha, go-yuga, ṣaḍ-gava. (The compounds—*pitā-maha, indriya-grāma, karma-kāṇḍa* etc.)

In these cases, the above words themselves are regarded as *taddhita* suffixes. To give them a suffixal look usual *it*- letters are added to them[4]; e.g., *ḍāmahac, grāmac, khaṇḍac* etc.

(vii) A few compounds with the word *bahu* as first member; e.g., *bahu-paṭu, bahu-mṛdu, bahu-guḍā* etc.

In such cases the word *bahu* is regarded as the suffix (*-bahuc*).[5]

---

[1] Pāṇ. 2.4. 62-66, 69-70; 4.1.88, 175-177; 4.3. 34-35; Vārt. on 4.3.87; 4.3.107; 4.4.24; 5.1.88; 5.2.127; 5.4.18, 121, 124, 132-133: *tadrājasya bahuṣu tenaiva astriyām*; *yaskādibhyo gotre*; *kambojāl luk*; etc.

[2] Pāṇ 4.4.24.

[3] Pāṇ. 5.3.32-36, 40-41: *paścāt*; *uttarādhara-dakṣiṇād ātiḥ*; *enab anyatarasyām adūre' pañcamyāḥ*; *dakṣiṇād āc*; *astāti ca*; etc.

[4] Vide Vārt. *tābhyāṁ pitari ḍāmahac* (on Pāṇ. 4.2.36); Vārt. *guṇādibhyo grāmaj vaktavyaḥ* (on Pāṇ. 4.2.37); Vārt. *kamalādibhyaḥ khaṇḍac pratyayo bhavati* (on Pāṇ. 4.2.51); *nara-kari-turaṅgānāṁ skandhac pratyayaḥ* (loc. cit.); *bhaurikyādi- aiṣukāryādibhyo vidhal-bhaktalau* (Pāṇ. 4.2.54); *yāpye pāśap* (ibid. 5.3.47); *ṣaṣṭhyā rūpya ca* (ibid. 5.3.54); *praśaṁsāyāṁ rūpap* (ibid. 5.3.66); *īṣad asamāptau kalpap-deśya-deśīyaraḥ* (ibid. 5.3.67); *vikāre snehane tailac, dvitve go-yugac, prakṛtyarthasya ṣaṭtve ṣaḍgavac, goṣṭhādayaḥ sthānādiṣu paśu-nāmādibhya upasaṁkhyānam.* (Vārt. on Pāṇ. 5.2.29); *pramāṇe dvayasaj-daghnañ-mātraca* (Pāṇ. 5.2.37).

[5] *bibhāṣā supo bahuc purastāttu*, Pāṇ. 5.3.68.

(viii) Words (numerals and compounds) with a portion of the stem elided, such as—*ekādaśa, viṁśa, triṁśa, pañcā-śa, prati-sāma, prati-loma, anu-loma, mahā-rāja, grāma-takṣa, ati-śva, adhyātma, antar-loma* etc.

In these words the suffixes that are assumed are: *-ḍaṭ, ḍac, -ac, -ṭac, -ap.*[1]

The words with a supposed *taddhita* suffix are included in the eight classes shown above. That these words are not really derived by the addition of *taddhita* suffixes will be clear from the following:

1. *General characteristic of all classes: No visible suffix:*

   No *taddhita* suffix is discernible in them. Had there been a suffix, it would have been noticed.

2. *Classes i-iii examined: vowel-change taken for suffix:*

   The only noticeable change in them is the change, in some of them, of the initial or final vowel, or of both. This is an internal change. Nothing external is added. Hence no question of suffix.

It is contended that the initial vowel-change (*ādi-vṛddhi*) is a sign of following *taddhita* suffix. But how can such a conclusion be drawn? In some cases this may be true, but not so in many other cases. In *āgneya, dainika* etc. the *vṛddhi* is followed by a suffix (*-eya, -ika* etc.). But in *Bhārata, daiva* (< *Bharata, deva*) etc. this is not the case. Therefore the above conclusion becomes fallacious, and cannot be the basis for further inference. In *Śaiva* etc., therefore, a *taddhita* suffix cannot be inferred on the strength of this.

Actually *ādi-vṛddhi* is an independent change, not dependent on a following *taddhita* suffix, for (*a*) it is seen also with *kṛt* and feminine suffixes., e.g. *nād-a, vās-a,* (< *nad-, vas-*); *nārī* (< *nara*); (*b*) it may not be present with any one of them; e.g., *kṛ-ti, gam-ana; div-ya, nara-tva; taruṇī, śūdrā*; etc.; (*c*) sometimes it may be optionally present with a suffix; e.g., *mānuṣ-a, manuṣ-a; vāpuṣ-a, vapuṣ-a*[2]; also cf. *sārva-janika, sarva-janīna.*[3]

Therefore from its presence i.e. *ādi-vṛddhi* nothing can be known for certain about a suffix following.

---

[1] ibid. 5.2.48; 5.4.73, 75, 91, 95-96, 108, 117: *tasya pūraṇe ḍaṭ bahu-vrīhau saṁkhyeye ḍaj a-bahu-gaṇāt*; *rājāhaḥ-sakhibhyaṣ ṭac*; etc.

[2] *Sans. Lang.* p. 198.

[3] *sarva-janāṭ ṭhañ khaś ca* (Vārt. on Pāṇ. 5.1.9).

Ādi-vṛddhi or any vowel-change is to be regarded as an ancient device to effect various grammatical changes. It has the same value as a suffix. Sometimes vowel-change and suffix may exist in the same derivative. But that need not make one subordinate to the other. It is just like the co-operation of two friends each of whom is capable of performing the act alone. Eng. *brethren* (< *brother* <*AS. brothor*), L. *genera* (< *genu-s*) are formed in this way i.e. by both vowel-change and suffix.

Three are the ways of forming derivatives in Sanskrit by these means : one, by suffix ; two, by vowel-change (at one or the other end or both) ; three, by both combined. For instance, *nara-tva* is by suffix alone, *Śaiva* is by vowel-change alone, and *dainika* by both.

Instances of vowel-change at the end and on both sides are given under classes (ii) and (iii) above. About the change of the final vowel a little more discussion is needed. This change looks like the addition of a suffix because of its final position where suffix also occurs. Yet there is a difference. While the suffix is an external element and is visible just after the stem, this change occurs in the final vowel of the stem itself. This is a change in the stem, not an addition to the stem. So this change cannot be regarded suffixal.

Thus *Dāśarathi* (< *Daśa-ratha*), *saikata* (< *sikatā*), *rāṣṭrapata* (< *rāṣṭra-pati*) etc. are derivatives by means of internal change, not by the addition of external elements (i.e. *taddhita* suffix).

To prove the final vowel-change to be suffixal the theory has been advanced that before *atddhita* suffixes the final *a* and *i* of the stem is elided.[1] This is equal to saying that *taddhita* suffixes (beginning with vowel) replace the stem-final (*a*, *i*). In *Śaiva* the final *a* is said to be the suffix coming in place of the stem-final *a*.

Now, if this be the case, then what is the difference between a suffix and a substitute (*ādeśa*) ? A suffix is to come 'after',[2] and an *ādeśa* 'in place of.'

If in *Śaiva a* is replaced by *a*, then that *a* is an *ādeśa*, not a suffix. But it serves no purpose to replace *a* by *a* : Hence there is neither suffix, nor substitution in *Śaiva*.[3]

---

[1] *yasyeti ca*, Pāṇ. 6.4.148.

[2] *pratyayaḥ* ; *paraś ca*, ibid. 3.1.1-2.

[3] Whitney has argued against this (*Sans. gram.* para 1208 i). But how does he admit root-words against Pāṇini ?

In *āgneya, Jaiminīya* etc. the suffix seems to have really replaced the final vowel of the stem (*agni-eya* > *agn-eya* > *āgn-eyā*). But this is only apparent. The truth is that here there is final vowel-change as well as a suffix: *āgneya* < *āgne-ya* < *agne-ya* < *agni-ya*. The suffix is *-ya*, and it has not replaced any portion of the stem. But the stem-final *i* has changed to *e*, as the initial *a* to *ā*. In all there are three factors responisble for the formation: change of initial vowel, change of final vowel, and addition of the suffix *-ya* (not *-eya* as usually supposed). In *Jaiminīya* the final vowel has changed to its lengthened form (*ī*): Jaimini-ya Jaiminī-ya.

In some cases, i.e. in *sugandhi* etc.[1] the final vowel-change is not regarded as suffixal by Pāṇini too. This is held to be an *ādeśa* there. Now, it becomes a contradiction if the final vowel-change is sometimes regarded as suffixal and sometimes an *ādeśa*. And this is obviously due to the fact that Pāṇini himself was not clear about the status of the final vowel-change. Actually this is an *ādeśa*, not a suffix, and so are all vowel-changes.

3. *Class (iv) examined: a. Lakṣaṇā misinterpreted:*

The words *Aṅgāḥ, Vaṅgāḥ, lavaṇa, Vāsavadattā* etc. are really primary words used in a secondary sense without a secondary suffix. In other words, these are *lākṣaṇika* use of primary words, which was not noted by Pāṇini. The use of words in a secondary capacity without a secondary suffix was obviously unknown to Pāṇini and his two great successors. This is why they had to assume a lost suffix to account for the sense in these words.[1] But the rhetoricians have since admitted secondary capacity of words, and *Kaliṅgaḥ sāhasikaḥ, kuntāḥ pra-viśanti* etc. are the universally accepted examples thereof. Therefore there is no reason why *Aṅgāḥ, lavaṇa, sukha, Vāsavadattā* etc. should not be treated alike.

---

[1] Kātyāyana, however, has disagreed with Pāṇini as regards the derivation of *lavaṇa* (salty). He does not admit any elision in the word indicating thereby that no *taddhita* affix was added to it. (*lavaṇāl lug vacanānarthakyaṁ rasavācitvāt*—Vārt. 1 on Pāṇ. 4.4.24). Patañjali joins hands with him: *lavaṇāl lug vacanam anarthakam. kiṁ kāraṇam? rasavācitvāt rasavācyeṣa lavaṇaśabdaḥ, naiṣa saṁ-sṛṣṭi-nimittaḥ.* (Mbhāṣ. on the above Vārt.).

Thus Kātyāyana and Patañjali agree with us that there is no *taddhita* affix and its elision in *lavaṇa*. The difference is that they think *lavaṇa* is a *rasavācī* word i.e. a separate adjectival word, while in our view it is the same *lavaṇa* (salt) used adjectivally, and this sort of use is *lakṣaṇā*.

b. Several words listed in (iv) above require a different explanation. These are *dvi-veda, tri-veda* (one who has studied two or three Vedas), *a-śakta, dvi-varṣa, priya-dharman* etc.

In such cases the necessary sense is available from the compound. Hence no suffix is necessary. *Dvi-veda=dvau vedau yasya; dvi-varṣa= dvau varṣau yasya; a-śakta=na śaktaḥ*[1]*; priya-dharman=priyaṁ dharma* (< *dharman*) *yasya.* The suffix *-anic*[2] is unnecessary, for the base *dharman* occurs in the Veda,[3] and there is no doubt that the compound has preserved this older stem.

4. *Class (v) examined: case-endings misrepresented:*

That *uttareṇa, dakṣiṇena* etc. are case-forms is obvious and admitted by modern scholars.[4] Hence no question of a *taddhita* suffix in them.

Uttareṇa, dakṣiṇena are Instr. cases used adverbially. Hence no *tahdhita* suff. *-enap*[5] can be admitted.

Purastāt etc. also are no exceptions. These are irregular ablative formations, probably analogical; cf. *paścātāt*[6] beside *paścāt* (<*paśca*, L. *post.*, after). From *puras* the normal ablative with-*tas* is *puras-tas*, and then taking *purasta* to be a base the next ablative form *purastāt* is doubtless made as *paścātāt* from *paścāt.* So is *adhastāt. avastāt* may have derived its and other things from *adhastāt* by reason of similarity in sense.[7]

Paścā, uttarā etc. are obviously nominative forms in the feminine, or rather instrumental without ending which is noted in the Veda.

5. *Class (vi) examined: Compounds not noted:*

Words of class (vi) are explicable by admitting compounds only: *pitāmaha=pitā mahaḥ* (=father grand, i.e. grand-father). For *maha* (grand, great), cf. *maho devo martyā ā-viveśa,*[8] also *mahi,*[9] and fem. *mahī.*

---

[1] There is no neccessity of assuming *śakta* as coming from *śakti.*

[2] *dharmād anic kevalāt,* Pāṇ. 5.4.124.

[3] "The older form is.....*dharman*". (SED).

[4] Vide Whitney's Grammar, pp. 408-410, paras 1110-117.

[5] It is noteworthy that Pāṇini finds *-ena* here, whereas in *janena, phalena* etc. he finds *-ina* (Pāṇ. 7.1.12), though the added element is the same in both cases.

[6] RV. 8.48.15: *pāhi paścātād uta vā purastāt.*

[7] *ava* like *adhas* has the sense of 'down'.

[8] Mbhāṣ. I.

[9] *yaḥ śaśvato mahi eno dadhānān* etc. RV. 2.12.10,

Indriya-grāma=indriyāṇāṁ grāmaḥ (village, assemblage, multitude).

Kumuda-khaṇḍa=kumudānāṁ khaṇḍam. The original meaning seems to be a 'piece of land where *kumuda* flowers grow or have grown; whence the sense 'a multitude of *kumuda* flowers' has developed. '*Khaṇḍa*' as a piece of land is pretty well-known; cf. *Uttarā-khaṇḍa, Kedāra-khaṇḍa.*

Karma-kāṇḍa=karmaṇāṁ kāṇḍam (a trunk of work, i.e. a number of things to be done). As from a tree-trunk all branches emanate, it may stand for 'many' or 'multitude'; cf. Eng. a 'beautiful head of hair. *nara-skandha= narāṇāṁ skandhaḥ.* In a crowd only the necks or heads of people are visible. Hence *nara-skandha*=a crowd, a collection, a division of army. So are *turaṅga-skandha* etc. The singular (*skandhaḥ*) for plural (*skandhāḥ*) may be for giving a collective idea as in *ikṣu-cchāya, pañcavaṭī* etc.

Bhauriki-vidha=Bhaurikeḥ vidhā (place). For this sense of *vidhā* cf. *cirāya sa-vidhe sthānaṁ priyasya bahu manyate*[1] where *sa-vidhe=samāna-sthāne.* The root *dhā*-(to hold) is involved and so the sense is quite possible. The change from *vidhā* to *vidha* is like *senā*>*sena* in compounds.

aiṣukāri-bhakta=aiṣukāriṇā bhaktaḥ (served).

vaiyākaraṇa-pāśa=vaiyākaraṇānāṁ pāśaḥ (chain, fetters), one who acts like fetters to the grammarians i.e. brings ignomyny or disgrace for them[2]; or *vaiyākaraṇaḥ pāśa iva,* a grammarian who always binds others in their speeches by insisting on petty or minute rules; hence a pedantic or bad grammarian who cannot think beyond his rules.

It is interesting to note that while *vaiyākaraṇa-pāśa* is in a bad sense, *keśa-pāśa,* and *karṇa-pāśa* are in good senses. But *pāśa* means the same thing in each case. *Keśa-pāśa* must have orig. meant *keśānāṁ pāśaḥ,* a fillet for hair. This beautified hair, whence the sense 'beautiful hair'.[3] *Karṇa-pāśa*=prob. orig. a ear-ring; cf. Beng etc. *kān-pāśā* (a particular ear ornament). *vaiyākaraṇa-rūpa=vaiyākaraṇānāṁ rūpaṁ* (beauty)—masculine by usage; Or *vaiyākaraṇasya iva rupaṁ yasya.* This is similar to *śvāpada, hasti-pāt, pitṛ-sthāna*[4] (having the same position as father), etc.

Devadatta-rūpya=Devadattasya rūpeṇa yuktḥ[5]—, with Devadatta's

---

[1] Sāh. III.

[2] or thwarts their progress by bad criticism etc. cf. Eng. 'to act as a brake'.

[3] Or *keśa-pāśa* may simply mean a 'hair-binding' i.e. what is called *kavarī* or *veṇī.*

[4] *sthānāntād vibhāṣā sasthāneneti cet,* Pāṇ. 5.4.10.

[5] Pāṇini has allowed *rūpya* in such a sense in 5.2.120.

picture inscribed on. The sense fits better in—*Vikramādityarūpyaṁ kārṣāpaṇam,* a rupee with Vikramāditya's picture on. The current sense is certainly derived from this.

A coin with Vikrama's picture originally belongs to Vikrama. Then it comes to the people. Therefore the current sense could easily develop from the orig. sense.

Vidvat-kalpa=viduṣaḥ kalpa iva kalpo yasya.[1] *kalpa*=way; cf. *prathamaḥ kalpaḥ,* the best way; *vikalpa,* the further way, next alternative; *anu-kalpa,* the way to be taken after. Hence the word means 'one in the scholarly way, scholar-like, almost a scholar.'

Vidvat-deśya,-deśīya=vidvat-deśe bhavaḥ, one in the scholars' world, i.e. almost a scholar.

hasta-mātra=hasto mātrā (measurement) *yasya.*

sarṣapa-taila=sarṣapāṇāṁ tailam (oil). *taila* orig. meant 'sesamum oil', then simply 'oil'.

go-goṣṭha=gavāṁ goṣṭha-; goṣṭha=orig. a grazing land for cows; here simply 'a grazing land'.

aśva-go-yuga=aśvānāṁ gāvaḥ; tāsām yugam. Go here means simply a female animal. The word means a pair of horse-cows or mares; cf. Syl. *garu-r gāi* (a cow-female), *bhaṣi-r gāi* (a buffalo-female). *gāi*<*Skt. go* (cow).

Compounds with *ṣaḍ-gava* is similarly explainable.

Thus it is clear that the words of this class are suffixless compounds

6. *Class (vii): Compound-cum-irony missed:*

bahu-paṭu=bahu (much) *paṭu-.* The word is used ironically[2] i.e. in the opposite sense 'not very expert'. There is no necessity of taking *bahu* for a suffix. Nor is it acceptable. A suffix cannot precede. Over and above, *bahu* is a well-known full-fledged word, and should not be claimed as a suffix. Since Pāṇini did not recognise *lakṣaṇā,* he could not account for the changed meaning of *bahu* (i.e. little), and hence he interpreted *bahu* to be a suffix in the sense of 'little'.

7. *Class (viii) examined: elision misrepresented:*

ekādaśa=ekādaśan minus *n*; *viṁśa=viṁśati* minus *ti.* So are other words. In such cases there is all elision, but no addition. Hence no question of suffix.

---

[1] Whitney also regards *kalpa* as a member of compound, not a suffix. See his Sans. Gram. p. 507.

[2] *=viparīta-lakṣaṇā.*

Thus it is clear that the words *Śaiva* etc. listed above are not derived by the addition of *taddhita* suffixes. Obviously Pāṇini could not think of a derivative or a derived meaning (i.e. secondary) without a suffix. So a suffix has been assumed for all such cases. But actually vowel-change, elision and *laksaṇā*[1] also play the same role as a suffix in many cases. This has not been noted in Pāṇini, who finds suffix everywhere.

27. REPETITION

The senses given in Pāṇini of *taddhita* suffixes (or what are known as such) are manifold.[2] But a minute comparison of them reveals that the number may be cut down considerably, for the dividing line between many is so thin as to be regarded as practically non-existent.

Thus there are unnecessary repetition of senses. Such cases are noted below :

(i) *tatra jātaḥ, tatra bhavaḥ, tatra prāya-bhavaḥ, tatra sam-bhūtaḥ, a-dūra-bhavaḥ, tatra uptaḥ, tatra puṣpyat, tatra pacyamānaḥ, samānodare śayitaḥ, samāna-tīrthe vāsī, so'sya nivāsaḥ, so'sya abhi-janaḥ, tata āgataḥ, tataḥ pra-bhavati.*[3]

(ii) *tasyāpatyam,* [*tasya gotrāpatyam*], *tasya idam, tasya nivāsaḥ, tasya vikāraḥ, tasya avayavaḥ, tasya purīṣaḥ, tasya phalam, tasya dharmyam, tasya karaṇam, tasya karma, tasya jalpaḥ, tasya karṣaḥ, tasya bhāgaḥ, tasya karaḥ, tasya īṣvaraḥ, tasya nimittam, tasya hananī, tasya vāpaḥ, tasya dakṣiṇā, tasya darśanam, tasya avakrayaḥ, tasyāh patiḥ, tasya vyākhyānaḥ, dhānyānāṁ kṣetram ; tena proktam, tena upajñātam, tena kṛta granthaḥ, dṛṣṭaṁ sāma.*[4]

(iii) *tena dīvyati, tena khanati, tena jitam, tena tarati, tena carati, tena jīvati, tena vartate, tena harati, tena ā-hṛtam, vrātena jīvati, tena nir-mitam, tena saṁ-skṛtam, tena upa-siktam, adbhiḥ saṁ-skṛtam, tena krītam, tena raktam, sasyena parijātaḥ.*[5]

(iv) *tena tulyam, tena samam, tena samitam, tena sammitam, sahasreṇa sammitam, tena tulyaṁ kriyā.*[6]

---

[1] = secondary use without suffix ; e.g. *Aṅgāḥ, sukha* etc. (class iv above).

[2] accurately, one hundred and eighty-six.

[3] Vide Pāṇ. 4.2.70 ; 4.3.25, 39, 41, 43-44, 53, 74, 83, 89-90 ; 4.4.107-108.

[4] ibid. 4.1.92-94, 98, 99 ; 4.2.13 ; 4.3.120, 134-135, 145, 163-167 ; 4.4.47, 50, 120-121, 143 ; 5.1.38, 42, 45, 124 ; etc.

[5] ibid.. 4.4.2, 5, 8, 12, 15 etc.

[6] ibid. 4.4.91 ; 5.1.115 etc.

(v) *tatra sādhuḥ, tatra kuśalaḥ, tatra ni-yuktaḥ, tatra pra-sitaḥ, tatra kāmaḥ.*[1]

tad adhīte, chando' dhīte, tad veda, tad vahati, tad harati, tad ā-vahati, tad avaharati, tad vidhyati, (tad) adhikṛtya kṛte granthe, tat pacati, tad rakṣati, tad vyāpnoti, yojanaṁ gacchati.[2]

tad asya paṇyam, tad asya śilpam, tad asya pra-haraṇam, tad asya karmādhyayane vṛttam, tad asya asti, tad asminn asti, tad asya sañjātam.[3]

(vi) *tasmai hitam, tasmai pra-bhavati, tadartham, tādarthye.*[4]

Not more than six sūtras are needed to express these senses, for actually only six basic senses have been repeated in different languages in them.

In the first group the sense is 'related to something by birth or origin' or 'the place of origin'; in the second it is 'belonging to'; in the third 'the instrument of doing something', in the fourth 'equal to'; in the fifth 'deals with; in the sixth 'meant for' or 'conducive to'.

Six sūtras: *tatra jātaḥ, tasya idam, tena karoti, tena tulyaḥ, tad ācarati, tasmai idam*—can serve the purpose well.

28. TADDHITA AFFIX VS SAMĀSA

It has not been noted that what is achieved by *samāsa* is more effectively done by *taddhita* affixes. Economy or brevity of expression is the soul of *samāsa* (=*saṁ-kṣepa*, brevity).[5] This is achieved by the addition of *taddhita* affixes in a remarkably better degree. In view of this the name *samāsa* may be extended to *taddhita* derivatives also. In other words, these derivaties may be regarded as a class of *samāsa*.

The comparative brevity achieved by both devices will be clear from the following examples:

---

[1] ibid. 4.3.38, 43; 4.4.98; 5.2.63 etc.

[2] ibid. 4.2.59; 5.2.84; 4.4.76; 5.1.50 etc.

[3] ibid. 4.4.51-52, 57 etc.

[4] ibid. 5.1.5, 12, 101; 5.4.24.

[5] cf. *samāsa-to bhautikaḥ sargaḥ* (Sāṁkhya-K. 53) etc.

	full expressions	abbreviation by *samāsa*	abbreviation by *taddhitas*
1.	*saṁ-śayam āpannaḥ*	*saṁ-śayāpanna, ā-panna-śaṁ-śaya*	*sāṁśayika*[1]
2.	*Pāṇininā proktam*	*Pāṇini-prokta*	*Pāṇinīya-*
3.	*dadhnā saṁskṛtam*	*dadhi-saṁskṛta-*	*dādhika*
4.	*gobhyo hitam*	*go-hita-*	*gavya-*
5.	*Himavataḥ patitā*[2]	*Himavat-patitā*	*Haimavatī*
6.	*Daśarathasya ātmajaḥ*	*Daśarathātmaja*	*Dāsarathi*
7.	*Mithilāyā rājā*	*Mithilā-rāja*	*Maithila-*
8.	*rājñaḥ karma*	*rāja-karma*	*rājya-, rāja-tva*
9.	*māse deyam*	*māsa-deya*	*māsika*
10.	*hrasvā kuṭī*	*hrasva-kuṭī*	*kuṭī-ra*
11.	*puṣpāṇi jātāni asyāḥ*	*jāta-puṣpā*	*puspitā*
12.	*vajram āyudham asya*	*vajrāyudha-*	*Vajrin*
13.	*śaktim anatikramya*	*yathā-śakti*	*śaktitaḥ*

These examples are enough to show that the shortening work (i.e., brevity of expression) is done better by the *taddhita* affixes than by the traditional *samāsas*. This type of abridgement may be called *taddhita-samāsa*.

Samāsa and *taddhita* having the same perpose both need not be used at a time when only one can do. But instances of both being used simultaneously are pretty frequent and there in no rule in grammar to prevent it; e.g., *Āgneya-purāṇa, Āśvamedhika-parva* etc. *Agnipurāṇa, Aśvamedha-parva* etc. by *samāsa* only should be the proper forms, for the sense of the *taddhita* is available from the *samāsa* itself. But here first *taddhita* and then also *samāsa* have been resorted to. This is unnecessary.

29. LACK OF UNIFORMITY

It has already been said (in *Kṛt* chapter) that same suffixes have been named differently in Pāṇini. This is true of the *taddhita* affixes too.[3]

[1] *varaṁ sāṁśayikaḥ raṇaḥ*—Veṇīs.

[2] = flowing, cf. *yatra Bhāgīrathī Gaṅgā patate diśam uttarām.* (Mbh., Anu., 25.15).

[3] The following examples will give an idea:

(i) For the suffix *-ya* there are the names: *-ya* (Pāṇ. 4.2.49-50, 94; 4.4.105, 137-138; 5.1.126 etc.), *-yak* (4.3.94; 5.1.128 etc.), *-yañ*

[Contd.]

Whatever may be the benefit from such namings, the great disadvantage, as has already been pointed out, is that words of same derivation are hereby kept apart, and this is a great methodological defect in the grammar.

30. MISCELLANEOUS

(i) Suffix before *ṭi*—It has been admitted that a suffix (*-akac*) is also added before the *ṭi* of the stem,[1] not at the end—its usual place. But this principle has not been maintained throughout. In *Gārgya, dharmya* etc. the suffix *-y* should be admitted as coming before *ṭi* : *Garg-a* > *Gārg-a Gārg-y-a ; dharm-a* > *dharm-y-a.* Instead the suffix *-ya*[2] is said to have replaced the final *a* in such cases[3] : *dharma* > *dharm* > *dharm-ya.* But it is better to admit *-y* before *ṭi,* for actually only a *y* (not *-ya*) has been added, *a* being already there in the stem.

Again, in *uccakaiḥ, nīcakaiḥ* etc. the suffix is clearly in its usual place i.e., at the end : *ucca-ka, nīca-ka* + the instrumental plural ending. But here it[4] is supposed to be before *ṭi.* Against this it may be said that (*a*) this is contrary to obvious facts, (*b*) *-ak* is an unheard of suffix, (*c*) and to add a *taddhita* suffix inside a declensional form is an untimely act. Suffixes are added to form the stem ; next comes declension of the finished stem. But after declension it is too late to add another suffix to the stem.

sarvake, viśvake=sarva-ka, viśva-ka, nom. plur. are declined like *sarva, viśva.*

tvayakā, mayakā, mayaki etc. are obviously artificial forms made to illustrate the rule (5-3-71) to the extreme.

[Contd.]
(4.1.105 ; 5.3.118 etc.), *-yat* (4.1.137 ; 4.2.17 etc., over eighty cases), *-yan* (4.2.42 ; 4.4.114), *-yap* (5.1.82-83 ; 5.2.120),*-yal* (4.4.131), *-ñya* (4.3.58 etc., ten cases), *-ñyaṅ* (4.1.171), *-ñyaṭ* (5.3.114), *-ḍyaṇ* (4.4.111), *-ṭyaṇ* (4.2.30), *ḍya, ḍyat* (4.2.9), *-ṇya* (4.1.85 etc., six cases), *-ṇyat* (5.1.83), *-ṣyañ* (5.1.123-124).

(ii) For *-ika* there are : *-ṭhak* (4.1.146 etc., over seventy cases), *-ṭhañ* (4.2.35, forty-five cases), *-ṭhac* (4.4.64 ; 5.3.78, 109), *-ṭhan* (5.2.85 etc., fourteen cases), *-ṭhap* (4.3.26), *-ṭiṭhan* (4.4.67 ; 5.1.25), *-vuñ* (5.1.133-134),*-vun* (4.3.125 ; 5.4.1-2),*-skan* (5.1.75),*-ṣṭan* (4.4.53 etc., nine cases), *-ṣṭac* (4.4.31), *-ṣṭal* (4.4.74).

[1] *avyaya-sarvanāmnām akac prāk ṭeḥ,* Pāṇ. 5.3.71.

[2] *-yañ, -yat* etc.

[3] *yasyeti ca,* Pāṇ. 6.4.148.

[4] = suff. *-ak.*

(ii) *Taddhita*-making feminine—*yuvati* is regarded as the feminine of *yuvan*, but the suffix *-ti* is called *taddhita*.[1] This is not understandable. A feminine-making suffix should be called a feminine suffix, not a *taddhita* suffix.

Actually *yuvati* is to be derived as *yuvat*+*i* (cf. *yuvat*+*ī*=*yuvatī*). For short *i* as fem. suff. beside long *ī*, cf. *jan-i*, *jāni* (woman, wife), beside *janī*.

The feminine-making power of *i* is evident also in *muni*, *kapi* etc. which are used also in the feminine (beside *munī*, *kapī* etc.). Had it not been so, only *munī* etc. could be so used.

---

[1] *taddhitāḥ*; *yūnas tiḥ*, Pāṇ. 4.1.76-77.

AUGMENTS (ĀGAMA)

AUGMENT AND SUFFIX CONFUSED

UNWARRANTED PRESUMPTION

31. AUGMENT AND SUFFIX CONFUSED.

From the Pāṇinian treatment it is not clear how an augment and a suffix are to be differentiated, or why a sound is to be called a suffix and another an augment. The following examples may be noted:

(i) *tud-a-ti, vad-a-ti* etc.

(ii) *svap-i-ti, śvas-i-ti, jakṣ-i-ti* etc.

In the first set of examples *a* is regarded as a suffix,[1] but in the second the *i* is called an augment.[2]

But there is no difference whatever as regards their function. Both serve as union-vowel between the root and the ending. Hence both deserve the same appellation, whether suffix or augment.

Another example deserves notice:

(i) *bhi-n-d-anti* etc.

(ii) *mu-n-c-anti* etc.

In the first case the *n* is regarded as a suffix,[3] while in the second it is called an augment.[4]

The little discussion in the Bhāṣya[5] on the difference of suffix and *augment* is not illuminating.

Therefore the conclusion is unavoidable that suffix and augment have been confused in the above cases (and more cases are available), and no clue is left as to why the discrimination has been made. Position cannot be a deciding factor, for both are admitted in all the three positions—beginning, middle and the end. In the above cases the positions too are the same.

---

1 *kartari śap*; *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ*, Pāṇ. 3.1.68, 77.

2 ibid. 7.2.76. *rud-ādibhya uttarasya val-ādeḥ sārva-dhātukasya iḍ-āgamo bhavati.* (Kāś.)

3 *rudhādibhyaḥ śnam*, Pāṇ. 3.1.78.

4 *śe mucādīnām*, ibid. 7.1.59.

5 On Pāṇ. 3.1.1. *pratyayaḥ paro bhavati, na ca vikārāgamāḥ pare*; *ṣaṣṭhī-nirdiṣṭhaṁ vikārāgama-yuktaṁ bhavati, pañcamī-nirdiṣṭācca pratyayo bhavati.* (Mbhāṣ).

32. UNWARRANTED PRESUMPTION.

In a number of cases augments have been assumed, though the forms are explainable without such assumption. After all, an augment is an extraneous element which is to be assumed only when the normal elements for word-building[1] cannot explain a form. If by the addition of a suffix or a prefix a form can be explained an augment need not be assumed.[2]

(i) *aṭ* (*a*)—*aṭ* is said to be an augment (*āgama*) in *laṅ*, *luṅ* and *lṛṅ* (e.g., *a-vad-at, a-bhut* etc.).

But on the strength of Vedic *ā-naṭ, ā-nak, ā-var, ā-vṛṇak* etc.[3], where *ā*, the prefix, has been prefixed to form these tenses, it can be said that the *a* in question is either shortened from *ā* or is another independent element used as a prefix . The use of *a* as a suffix is frequent (e.g. *śam-a, dam-a* etc.). This makes *a* a well-known element of word-formation. Therefore this need not be regarded as an extraneous element i.e., *āgama*. The *a* that is used as a suffix may be regarded as used as a prefix here. The multi-purpose uses of suffixes have already been dwelt upon.

In another view this *a* may be a separate word meaning 'there', 'then', which came to be compounded with the verb.[4] From the irregular *sandhi* in *aicchat, aurṇot* etc., where the *a* is heard, it has been argued that the *a* was originally pronounced as a separate syllable, with hiatus.[5]

Whether the *a* be a separate word, or the suffix acting as prefix, or a shortened form of *ā* (in Vedic *ā-naṭ* etc.), in no case is it an *āgama*.

(i)*a*. *aṭ* (*a*)—The same vowel is regarded as an augment in *leṭ* forms like *tāriṣat, joṣiṣat* etc.,[6] and *laṅ* forms *arod-a-t, asvap-a-t* etc.[7]

But there is no reason why this should not be identified with the *a* in *avad-a-t, apaṭh-a-t* etc., where *a* is not called an *āgama*. Actually the suffix *-at* is present in both cases, in the former there being an additional *-iṣ-*.

---

[1] root, stem, suffix, prefix.

[2] cf. *dṛṣṭaṁ varam adṛṣṭataḥ*—Kumārila's Ślokavārtika.

[3] *chandasyapi dṛśyate*, Pāṇ. 6.4.73.

[4] Sans. Lang., p. 303.

[5] loc. cit.

[6] *leṭo' ḍāṭau*, Pāṇ. 3.4.94.

[7] *aḍ gārgya-gālavayoḥ*, ibid. 7.3.99.

Therefore the *a* need not be an *āgama*. It is clearly a suffix (to be called *vikaraṇa* where possible). Pāṇini could have admitted the *vikaraṇa* in *arodat* etc. had he not earlier made a statement that there is no *vikaraṇa* in the conjugation of *ad-* etc.

(ii) *asuk*—This *āgama* is admitted in the Vedic nom. plur. forms of *a*-stems, such as, *janāsas, devāsas* etc. Thus *janāsas*=*jana*+*asuk* (*āgama*) +*jas* (ending).[1]

There is no need of such an augment. Actually the nom. plur. ending has been repeated here. *janāsas*=*jana*+*as* (ending)+*as* (ending). This is a case of double plural with a definite sense. *janāsas*=the plural of *janās* (pl. of *jana*). As in English 'people' is already plural (=men), but again it may take ending (=peoples) to denote 'races' or 'nations' of men, so *janāsas* doubtless means the same thing i.e., 'peoples', 'races', 'nations',[2] while the normal plural *janās* means 'people' or 'men'.

It is better to find a meaning of *-as-* (*jana-as-*) than regard it as a meaningless augment.

(iii) *āṭ*—This is an augment admitted in *loṭ* 1st person forms[3]—*pat-āni, vad-āni* etc., and *leṭ* forms[4]—*pat-āti, pat-āsi* etc.

Actually, however, this is a suffix, which may be regarded as a *vikaraṇa* here. If in *vad-a-ti, pat-a-ti* etc. the *a* is a *vi-karaṇa*, then the *ā* in *pat-ā-ni, pat-ā-si* etc. should also be treated alike. There is no difference in the position or function of both. The same *vikaraṇa* is seen also in *laṭ* 1st person—*vad-ā-mi, vad-ā-vas* etc. But Pāṇini offers a different explanation there. According to him the *ā* in *laṭ* 1st person is a mere lengthening of the *vikaraṇa a* (*śa, śap*).[5]

Thus Pāṇini has two explanations[6] for the same fact, which is another evidence against his view.

The fact is that of the many *vikaraṇas* only a few have been admitted in Pāṇini. For the rest different explanations are offered.

---

[1] *āj jaser asuk*, Pāṇ 7.1.50.

[2] *sa janāsas India* (RV. 2. 12) therefore really means 'He, O races of men, is Indra.'

[3] *āḍ uttamasya pic ca*, Pāṇ. 3.4.92.

[4] *leṭo' ḍāṭau*, ibid. 3.4.94.

[5] *ato dīrgho yañi*, ibid. 7.3.101.

[6] (1) *āgama*.
(2) lengthening.

(iv) *āduk*—This augment is supposed to occur in *ekānnaviṁśati* etc.[1] Thus *ekānna.* is said to be = *eka* + *āduk* (*āgama*) + *na* + *viṁśati.*

But this augment need not be assumed. Admission of the 5th case-ending in *eka* explains the formation more satisfactorily. *ekānna.*=*ekāt* (abl. of *eka*) *na viṁśatiḥ*, 'not twenty by one'. The 5th case here expresses 'cause'. *ekāt*=by reason of one. But since there is no provision for general *hetau pañcamī* in Pāṇini,[2] the form is sought to be explained by admitting an augment *āduk.*

(v) *ānuk*—please see *nuk* below.

(vi) *iṭ*—This augment is assumed in a large number of verb forms, such as *gam-i-ṣyati, sev-i-ta, sav-i-tā* etc.[3]

Actually this is a suffix, and may be regarded as *vikaraṇa* where possible. If in *vad-a-ti, sev-a-te* etc. *a* is a *vikaraṇa*, then the *i* in question need not be otherwise. Obviously, this is called an *āgama* because no such *vikaraṇa* (*i*) is earlier admitted.

(vii) *īṭ*—This is admitted as an *āgama* in some verb forms, such as *bravīti, arodīt* etc.[4]

But *ī* is to be regarded as another *vikaraṇa.* In the conjugation of *rud-* etc. several *vikaraṇas* are involved ; cf. *rod-i-ti* (*i*), *a-rod-ī-t* (*ī*), *a-rod-a-t* (*a*).

(viii) *tithuk*—This augment is admitted in the following words :— *bahu-titha, puga-titha, gaṇa-titha* and *sangha-titha.*[5] Thus, *bahu-titha*= *bahu*+*tithuk* (*āgama*)+*ḍaṭ* (suff.).

But this is unnecessary. A simple *Bahu-vrīhi* compound can explain the formation more easily. *bahu-titha*=*bahavas tithayo yasmin* ; cf. *a-tithi* (guest, lit. dateless i.e. unexpected arrival). The *i* of *tithi* changed to *a* because this is a common occurrence in *samāsa* ; cf. *dvyaṅgula* (<*dvi-aṅguli*), *puṣkarākṣa* (<*puṣkara-akṣi*) etc.

This is substantiated also by the use of the word in the following stanza :

---

[1] *ekādiś caikasya cāduk*, Pāṇ. 6.3.76.

[2] Both Pāṇini and Patañjali are silent on it. The admission of *hetau pañcamī* by means of *yoga-vibhāga* in the Kaumudī is therefore questionable. (For case-endings allowed in a *hetu* vide Chap. XV, *hetau*, ff.)

[3] *ārdhadhātukasya iṭ valādeḥ* etc., Pāṇ. 7.2.35-78.

[4] *bruva īṭ* ; *rudaśca pañcabhyaḥ* etc., ibid. 7.3.93-98.

[5] *bahu-pūga-gaṇa-saṁghasya tithuk*, Pāṇ. 5.2.52.

rājann ājagaraṁ carma
śuṣkaṁ Vṛndāvane 'dbhutam,
Vrajaukasāṁ bahu-tithaṁ
babhūvākrīḍa-gahvaram.[1]

Here *babu-titha* means 'for many days'. Had it been derived in the Paninian way, it could not mean this without a word meaning 'time' such as *kāla, samaya* etc., which is here absent. For *-titha* as a suffix does not give the sense of 'time'.

titha as a separate word meaning time etc. is also admitted by some.[2]

(ix) *nuk, ānuk—nuk* is assumed in *antar-vatnī* and *pati-vatnī*,[3] and *ānuk* in a number of words *Indrāṇī, ācāryānī* etc.[4]

But actually a feminine suffix *-nī* is to be admitted in such cases: *antar-vat-nī, pati-vat-nī ; ācāryānī* etc. are clearly double feminines : *ācārya*> *ācāryā* (fem.)>*ācāryā-nī* (doubly fem.).

For *-nī* as a fem. suff. cf. Pkt. *go-ṇī*, Beng. Hindi etc. *rā-ṇī*, Beng. *māṣṭār-ni, ḍāktār-nī, dhopā-nī* etc. ; also Germ. *lehrer-in Czar-in*, Fr. *Czar-ine*, Sp., Port. & It. *Czar-ina*. In these forms the suff. *-in, -ine* is doubtless metathetic for Skt. *-nī* ; *-ina* may be a combination of two suffixes *-in*+*a*. (Skt. *nī*+*ī*).

Therefore it is needless to assume the augments *nuk* and *ānuk*, which with the suff. *-ī* are to form *-nī, -ānī*. This type of splitting up of a suffix into an *āgama* and a suffix is noted elsewhere too in Pāṇini. Thus the genitive plur. ending *-nām* is split as *nuṭ* (*āgama*)+*ām* (ending).[5] But this procedure is not uniformly maintained, for the instr. sing. ending *-nā* is not so split, but admitted as one whole occurring as a substitute for *-āṅ*.[6] This shows that the splitting up is not the ultimate truth, but only a way of showing suffix, which is the sum total of both sides (=*āgama* and suff.). Otherwise *-nā* would not have been admitted to be a whole.

Therefore it is better not to admit *āgama*s in such cases, which are misleading.

---

[1] Bhāg. 10.12.32.

[2] Vide SED.

[3] *antarvat-pativator nuk*, Pāṇ. 4.1.32.

[4] *Indra-varuṇa-bhava-śarva-rudra-mṛḍa-himāraṇya-yava-yavana--mātula--ācāryāṇām ānuk*, ibid. 4.1.49.

[5] *hrasva-nadī-āpo nuṭ*, Pāṇ. 7.1.54.

[6] ibid. 7.3.130 ; also cf. the *vikaraṇas u* and *nu* (*śnu*), where *nu* is not split as *n*+*u*.

(x) *nuṭ*—This is admitted as an *āgama* in gen.plur. ending *-nām*. But again the instr. sing. ending *-nā* is admitted to be a whole, though it could be split as *nuṭ*+*ā*. Hence *-nām* too need not be split and may be regarded as a whole. That is, the admission of the augment *nuṭ* is unnecessary. (Please see No. ix also).

(xi) *maṭ*—This augment is admitted in ordinal numerals like *pañcama, saptama* etc.[1] Thus *pañcama* is derived as *pañcan*+*maṭ* (*āgama*)+*ḍaṭ* (suff.).

But *-ma* is frequently met with as a suffix, and hence here too it need not be otherwise. For *-ma* (suff.) cf.—

(*a*) *kṛt—kṣā-ma pra-stī-ma*

(*b*) *taddhita—madhya-ma,*[2] *dru-ma, dyu-ma*[3]*;* also as superlative: *para-ma, adha-ma* etc.

(*c*) *tiṅ—a-yā-ma, a-bhū-ma* etc.

Hence the *-ma* in *pañca-ma* etc. need not be an *āgama.*

(xii) *mum*—This augment is admitted in a number of words—*parantapa, kulaṁkaṣa, rātriñcara, priyaṁvada, a-sūryampaśyā* etc.[4]

But obviously the *m* in all these formations is the accusative ending, not an *āgama.* Thus *parantapa*=*param* (acc.)+*tap-a.*

Since Pāṇini does not recognise endings within a *prātipadika,*[5] the words became a problem for him, and as a way out of it the *m* has been dismissed as an *āgama.* But as in a number of cases non-elision of endings has been admitted (e.g. *vane-cara, Yudhiṣṭhira* etc.) in a *prātipadika,* so should it be admitted here also. Most probably the assumption of the *āgama* is with a view to keeping the number of *a-luk* cases reduced. Otherwise the theory that endings are dropped from within a *prātipadika* loses its force to a great extent.

The acc. ending in the midst of such forms is recognised by modern scholars.[6]

(xiii) *yak*—This is an augment admitted in the Vedic suffix *-tvāya* (for classical *-tvā*), which is split as *-tvā* (suff.)+*yak* (augment).

---

[1] *nāntād a-saṁkhyāder maṭ*,Pāṇ. 5.2.49

[2] *madhyān maḥ*, ibid. 4.3.8.

[3] *dyu-drubhyāṁ maḥ*, ibid. 5.2.108.

[4] *arurdviṣad-ajantasya mum*; etc., Pāṇ. 6.3.67, 70-72.

[5] *supo dhātu-prātipadikayoḥ*, ibid. 2.4.71.

[6] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 1250.

Actually however *-tvāya* is a combination of both *-tvā* and *-ya* which are also used separately for forming a gerund. Such doubling of suffixes is seen elsewhere too; e.g., *śreṣṭha-tara, -tama, garīyas-tara, -tama* etc.[1]; also L. *magister* (>Eng. *magistrate*)=*mag* (=Skt. *mah-*)+*-is*, comp. suff. (=Skt. *-īyas*)+*ter* (=Skt. *-tara*), the whole being equivalent to a Skt. *mahīyastara;* also cf. Skt. *vārāhyā, vālākyā* etc. where fem. suff. *-ī* and *-ā* have combined. Of *janāsas*(=*jana*+*as*+*as*), *ācāryānī* etc. with double suffixes mention has already been made.

Hence the augment *yak* need not be assumed. Says Prof. Burrow:

> "Beside *-tvā* the RV. also has a form *-tvāya* which appears to be a contamination of the two alternative forms[2] just mentioned."[3]

(xiv) *ruṭ*—This is supposed to be an augment in the conjugation of some verbs—*śī-, vid-, duh-* etc.[4]; e.g., *śe-r-ate, a-śe-r-ata, saṁ-vid-r-ate* etc.

But clearly a suff. *-ra* (not augment *r*) is concerned here, and may be called *vikaraṇa* where possible. Thus *śerate*=*śe-ra-te, aśerata*=*a-śe-ra-ta* (*vikaraṇa*); *aduhra*=*a-duh-ra* (ending).

For *-ra* as a suffix cf.—

(*a*) *kṛt*—*nam-ra, hiṁs-ra* etc.

(*b*) *taddhita*—*madhu-ra, kuṭī-ra* etc.

also. *Ind-ra, vaj-ra, aj-ra* (=Gk. *ag-ro-s*), *gṛdh-ra, cand-ra* etc.

Hence *-ra* as a suffix (ending, *vikaraṇa*) is to be admitted here, not as an *āgama*.[5]

(xv) *sīyuṭ* (*ī*)—This augment is admitted in *vidhi-liṅ ātmanepada* forms, *edheta* etc. Thus *edheta* is derived in Pāṇini as *edh-*+*śap*+*sīyuṭ* +*ta* (*edh-*+*a*+*ī*+*ta*).

This is unnecessary. A *vikaraṇa e* is to be admitted in such cases: *edh -e-ta*. This *e* is found in other cases too; cf. *sev-e-te, sev-e-the* etc. Pāṇini does not recognise this *vikaraṇa* (*e*), and hence the necessity of admitting the augment *i* by the side of the *vikaraṇa a*. But neither the *vikaraṇa a* nor the augment *i* is involved here. A simple *vikaraṇa e* exaplins the formation better. If in *edh-a-te a* is *vikaraṇa*, why not *e* a *vikaraṇa* in *edh-e-te, edh-e-ta* etc.?

In this way many of the *āgamas* admitted in Pāṇini are unnecessary.

---

[1] ibid. para 473d.

[2] *–tvā* and *–ya*.

[3] Sans. Lang., p. 371.

[4] *śīṅo ruṭ*; *vetter vibhāṣā*; *bahulaṁ chandasi*, Pāṇ. 7.1.6-8.

[5] Also vide Sans. Lang. p. 312:

SUBSTITUTION (ĀDEŚA)

UNACCEPTABLE SUBSTITUTES

ADEŚA AND ĀGAMA CONFUSED

ADEŚA AND SUFFIX CONFUSED

33. UNACCEPTABLE SUBSTITUTES

The *ādeśas* or substitutes in the following cases are not acceptable :

(i) *akaṅ*—in *Vaiyāsaki, vāruḍaki, naiṣādaki, cāṇḍālaki* etc.[1]

Here the derivation proposed is *Vyāsa*+*akaṅ* (*ādeśa*)+*iñ* (suff.). But there is no recessity of admitting the substitute, or spiltting the added element into an *ādeśa* and a suffix. The suffix *-ki* is to be admitted instead of *-iñ*, whereupon the necessity of any *ādeśa* ceases.

The suffix *-ki*, however, may be regarded as derived from the suff. *-ka*[2] with a vowel-mutation in the derivative : *Vyāsa*>*Vyāsa—ka*>*Vaiyāsa-ki*.

(ii) *Agasti*—for *Āgastya* in *Agastaya-ḥ*[3]. *Agasti* cannot be a substitute for *Āgastya*, but is an original word.[4] Obviously *Āgastya* is a derivative from *Agasti*. In *Agastaya-ḥ* the word *Agasti* has been used in a secondary sense, i.e., in the sense of descendants of *Agasti*. *Āgastya* is not necessary for the formation of *Agastaya-ḥ*.

The derivative sense without a taddhita suffix was not recognised in Pāṇini, and hence in every such case a taddhita suffix has been assumed even though it is not there. Thus *Agastaya-ḥ* without a suffix has been assumed to have been linked with *Āgastya* which has a taddhita. But derivative sense without a suffix is recognised in Sanskrit, e.g. *Kaliṅga-ḥ sāhasika-ḥ, kuntā-ḥ pra-viśanti* etc. Therefore in *Agastaya-ḥ* too the same is to be recognised, and *Āgasti* need not be regarded as a substitute for a taddhita derivative (*Āgastya*).

Lastly, the plur. form *Āgastyā-ḥ* also occurs[5] and so *Agastaya-ḥ* cannot be regarded as the plur. of *Āgastya*.

---

[1] *Vyāsa-varuḍa-niṣāda-caṇḍāla-bimbānāmiti vakavyam*, Vārt. on Pāṇ. 4.1.97.

[2] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 1221 b.

[3] *āgastya-kauṇḍinyayor agasti-kuṇḍinac*,Pāṇ. 2.4.70.

[4] Vide Uṇ. IV. 179 ; besides, a large number of derivatives *Agastya, Āgastya, Agastīya, Āgastīya, Āgasti*, etc. are clearly based on *Agasti*.

[5] MBh, 3.791 (Vide SED).

(iii) *aṅ*—for *-cli* in *luṅ* forms *a-vocat, āsthata* etc.[1]

First, *-cli* is an imaginary suffix which is never used. It is the general name of a number of suffixes of the aorist. Hence there is no question of a substitute for it. Nothing can be a substitute for nothing.

Secondly, the *a*(*ṅ*), when it occurs in verb forms, is a clear *vi-karaṇa*. *avocat*=*a-voc-a-t*, where the *a*(*ṅ*) is underiably a *vi-karaṇa*. If in *vad-a-ti*, *a-vad-a-t* etc., the *a* (second one) is a *vi-karaṇa*, so is the corresponding *a* in *a-voc-a-t* etc. But since *vi-karaṇa*s are recognised only in *sārvadhātuka lakāra-s*, the same vowel in other *lakāras* is differently interpreted. Actually, however, there is no difference to justify this discrimination. This aorist (*avocat* etc.) is known as *a*-aorist in modern grammar, and is treated as equivalent in form to the imperfect of *á*-class roots.[2] This proves that the *a* in question is the same as the *vikaraṇa* of *sārvadhātuka lakāra*s.

(iv) *anaṅ*—for the stem-final in *ūdhas, dhanus* (both in compounds), *asthi, sakthi, dadhi* and *akṣi* (in some of their case-forms).[3]

But evidence is available that at least alternative bases in *-an* existed side by side with *ūdhas* etc.; cf. Goth. *augon*, Gk. *okkon, assi* (eye); Gk. *osteon* (bone). Gk. *okkon*, Goth, *augon* clearly correspond to a Skt. *akṣan*; Gk. *assi* to Skt. *akṣi*; Gk. *osteon* to a Skt. *asthan*. Therefore *-an* as *ādeśa* need not be admitted.[4]

(v) *am*—for the stem-final in *Avyayībhāva* compounds ending in *a*,[5] and for *-su* and *-am* (endings) of neuter *a*-stems,[6] such as *upa-kū-lam, phalam* (nom. acc.) etc.

But it is not *-am*, but *-m* that has anything to do with these formations: *upa-kūla*>*upa-kūla-m*; *phala*>*phala-m*.

Again, the *-m* is the same in both cases, and need not be separately treated. It is the acc. sing. ending. of *a*-stems. *Upa-kūla-m* really=*upa kūlam*, where the accusative is due to the proposition *upa*; cf. *upa Hari-ṁ*

---

1 *asyati-vakti-khyātibhyo'ṅ*, Pāṇ. 3.1.52.

2 Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 752 g; 846b.

3 *ūdhaso' naṅ*; *dhanuṣaś ca*; *vā saṁjñāyām*; *asthi-dadhi-sakthi-akṣṇām anaṅ udāttaḥ*, Pāṇ. 5.4.131-133; 7.1.75.

4 Also vide Whitney's Grammar, paras 430d & 431, where he shows these as *an*-stems and speaks of their other forms later.

5 *nāvyayībhāvād ato'm tu a-pañcamyāḥ*; *tṛtīyā-saptamyor bahulam*, Pāṇ. 2.4.83-84.

6 *svamor napuṁsakāt*; *ato'm*, ibid. 7.1.23-24.

surā-ḥ. This *-m* which is properly acc. ending is also used as nom. ending with neuter bases in *a*. But this cannot be said to be a substitute for *-s*, for *-s* is never seen in neuter nom. sing. It may be said that there is no nom. form of neut. stems at all.[1] The acc. forms are used as nom. also. Hence there is no question of substitution of *-am* for *-su*.

(vi) *aś*—for *idam* and *etad* in some of their case-forms—*asmai*, *asya*, *atra* etc.[2]

But *asmai* etc. though traditionally regarded as forms of *idam* and *etad*, have little connection with them. Obviously they are derived from a stem *a*. : *a-smai*, *a-sya*, *a-tra*, *a-tas* etc. Says Whitney—

> "The former of these two pronouns, *ayam* etc., plainly shows itself to be pieced together from a number of defective stems. The majority of forms come from the root *a*....."[3]

Also cf. Vedic *a-yos* (gen. loc. du.), *a-yā*; Hindi *vah* (dial. *o*), Beng. *o* (he), Hindi dial. *o-me* (in that).

Hence there is no question of substitution of *aś* for *idam*, *etad*.

"The stems *a-*, *ana-*, and *ima-* form part of the *ayam* declension"[4]

(vii) *ākam*—for *-sām* in *asmākam* and *yuṣmākam*.[5]

Elsewhere *asmāka* and *yuṣmāka* are put forward as indivisible *ādeśas* for *asmad* and *yuṣmad*.[6] Here these are split as *asmad*, *yuṣmad*+*āka(m)*, an *ādeśa*. This is inconsistent. What is once said to be a substitute for *asmad*, *yuṣmad* is here said to be *asmad*, *yuṣmad* plus another element *ākam*.

Actually *asmākam* and *yuṣmākam* are variants of *āsmāka*. and *yauṣmāka*. In one set there is *vṛddhi*, in another not. These are not properly genitive cases. Hence there is no question of substitution of *-ākam* for *-sām*.

---

[1] One reason for this may be that neuter nouns are by nature objects, not subjects. Subjectivity in them is assumed, not real.

[2] *idamo' nvādeśe aś anudāttas tṛtīyādau*; *etadas tra-tasos tra-tasau cānudāttau*, Pāṇ. 2.4.32-33.

[3] Sans. Gram. para 502, also vide SED (on *a*).

[4] Sans. Lang. p. 274.

[5] *sāma ākam*, Pāṇ. 7.1.33.

[6] *tasminnani ca yuṣmākāsmākau*, ibid. 4.3.2.

(viii) *āt*—for the stem-final in *mahat, dvi, aṣṭan,* and for *-ṅasi* after *a*-stems[1].

Thus *mahā, dvā, aṣṭā, narāt* etc.

Now *mahā* may be regarded as an independent form coming from a base *mahan*. The root *mah* has produced a number of stems : *maha(n)t, maha, mahi, mahī, mahas*. To this list may be added a *mahan*, whence *mahā*. Whatever the base, there is conclusive evidence in the Veda that *mahā* was a nom. sing. form. For there is the acc. sing. masc. form *mahām* used more than once in the RV[2].

Hence there is no question of deriving *mahā* from *mahat* by substituting *ā* for *t*.

Dvā is a regular Vedic dual beside *dvau;*, cf. *dvā suparṇā* etc.[3] Hence it cannot be regarded as derived by substitution from *dvi* under certain circumstances.

The case is almost similar with *aṣṭā*. Since there is the form (nom. acc.) *aṣṭau*, the *ā*-form *aṣṭā* is expected, and is actually found in the Veda.[4] Hence this need not be derived by substitituion. *aṣṭāviṁśati=aṣṭā viṁṣati*, eight-and-twenty ; *dvāviṁśati=dvā viṁśati*, two-and-twenty.

The abl. *-āt* in masc. neut. *a*- stems is to be regarded as an independent ending and not a substitute. Every ending or suffix is independent, and one need not be made a substitute for another. The suffixes *-matup, -ini, -vini* etc. are used in the same sense. But for that reason none have been looked upon as substitute for another. So why of *-āt* and *-ṅasi* should *-āt* be a mere substitute, while the other a full-fledged ending ?

(ix) *ānaṅ*—for the stem-final of the first member in a *Dvandva* compound, such as *mātā-pitarau, Indrā-Varuṇau* etc.[5]

Since *mātā* is the regular nom. sing. form, it need not be derived otherwise in the above compound. Rather the compound may be regarded as *a-luk*.

Indrā-Varuṇau, Mitrā-Varuṇau etc. actually have both members in the dual. *Indrā, Mitrā=Indrau, Mitrau*. Their accent also shows it.

---

[1] *ānmahataḥ samānādhikaraṇa-jātīyayoḥ* ; *dvyaṣṭanaḥ saṁkhyāyām.....*; *ṭā-ṅasi-ṅasām ina-āt-syāḥ*, ibid. 6.3.46-47, 49 ; 7.1.12.

[2] RV. 2.22.1 (*mahām uruṁ.....devam* etc.) ; 3 49.1 (*mahām Indram* etc.)

[3] Śvet-UP. 4.6.

[4] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para, 483.

[5] *ānaṅ ṛto dvandve* ; *devatā-dvandve ca*, Pāṇ. 6.3.25-26.

For both members carry the *udātta* which shows that both are independent forms (du.). Therefore there is no need of assuming a suhstitute *ānaṅ*.

(x) *āha*—for *brū-* in *āha, āhatus* etc.[1]

But *āha* need not be a substitute for *brū*-in the above cases. These forms are clearly derived, not from *brū-*, but from a root *ah-*, which though not otherwise used in Sanskrit, is provable from other related languages ; cf. L. *neg-are*, to say no, which is fr. *n'-eg-* (=Skt. *ah-*) ; Ir. *ag-all*, speech ; Goth. *af-aika* (I deny)[2].

"*āha*—perf. 3rd per. sing. of the defective verb *ah-*".[3]

(xi) *īt*—for the stem-final in *agni* in *Agnī-Marutau* etc[4].

Agnī is to be regarded as the dual (nom. acc.) form, as *Indrā* etc. (in *Indrā-Varuṇau* etc.). The accent also shows it. For, both members carry the *udātta* which is indication enough that both members are fully inflected and independent words. Hence the question does not arise of any substitution.

(xii) *eta*—for *idam* in *etarhi.*[5]

It cannot be admitted that *etarhi* has anything to do with *idam*. Obviously the word is derived from *etad*. In the face of a base *eta*(*d*) another *ādeśa eta* for *idam* need not be assumed.

(xiii) *ena*—for *idam, etad* in *enam, enena, enayoḥ* etc.[6]

But *ena* is no substitute, but a separate stem. A number of stems are responsible for the traditional forms of *etad* and *idam*, of which *ena* is one. "There is a defective pronominal stem *ena*." (Whitney).[7] Beng. *ini* (Syl. *ein*), *uni* (he, she) are prob. fr. this (*ena*).

(xiv) *auś*—for *-jas, -śas* after *aṣṭan.*[8] Thus *aṣṭau* (nom. acc. plur.).

But actually the *-au* in *aṣṭau* is the regular dual ending (*au, auṭ*), and hence there is no question of substitution of *auś* for *-jas, -śas*. The other

---

[1] *bruvaḥ pañcānām ādita āho bruvaḥ*, ibid. 3.4.84.

[2] Vide SED on ah-.

[3] loc. cit.

[4] *īd agneḥ Soma-Varuṇayoḥ*, Pāṇ. 6.3.27.

[5] *etetau rathoḥ*, Pāṇ. 5.3.4.

[6] *idamo' nvādeśe'ś anudāttas tṛtīyādau* ; etc. ibid. 2.4.32-34.

[7] Sans. Gram. para 500.

[8] *aṣṭābhya auś*, Pāṇ. 7.1.21.

form *aṣṭā* proves it. If *narau, narā*; *dvau, dvā* etc. are dual forms, why not *aṣṭau, aṣṭā* ?

A question may arise—If *aṣṭau* is dual, then it should mean 'two eights' i.e., sixteen. But that is not the case. The answer is that the base *aṣṭa* (>*aṣṭau, aṣṭā*) probably does not mean 'eight' but 'four', so that the dual form means 'two fours' i.e., eight. A further question why 'eight' should be expressed in that way—may arise. The reply is that probably the four fingers (excluding the thumb) of each hand were shown to express 'eight', as even now five fingers of each are shown to express 'ten.'

According to Prof. T. Burrow L. *octo* (*u*), Skt. *aṣṭau*, etc. are connected with an Avestan *asti*, which means 'the width of four fingers.' Hence he thinks Latin, Sanskrit (etc.) forms originally meant 'two groups of four fingers.'[1] Hence the base *aṣṭa* means 'four fingers' or 'four'.

(xv) *ka*—for *kim*[2] and *-kta*[3] in *ka-ḥ, kau, ke, kam* etc. and *śuṣka*, respectively.

But *kaḥ, kau* etc. are obviously from a stem *ka*, which need not be regarded as a substitute for *kim*. The stem *kim*[4] is noticeable only in the nom. acc. neuter form *kim*. All other forms are from *ka*,[5] which stem has not been recognised in Pāṇini.

In *śuṣka* the *-ka* need not be regarded as a substitute for *-kta*. It is an independent suffix. Besides *-kta* some other suffixes also form past participles. These are: *-na, -va, -ka* etc. In Pāṇini only *-kta* is recognised, and hence the rest are regarded as substitutes. But properly they are as good as *-kta*. They may be less used, but this is no reason to deny them the name of suffix.

(xvi) *ku* (=*k, kh, g, gh*)—for *c, j, ś, h* in *pāka, rāga, īdṛk, ghātayati* etc.

But such substitution is just the reverse of the findings of modern philology, which has shown that *c, j, ś, h* are rather substituted in Sanskrit for original *ku* or gutturals (*k, g, gh*).

(xvii) *kuṇḍinac*—for *Kauṇḍinya* in *Kuṇḍinā-ḥ*.[6]

But *Kuṇḍināḥ* is the plur. of *Kuṇḍina*, and is used in a secondary sense without a taddhita suffix. *Kauṇḍinya* too is from *Kuṇḍina*. Thus both

---

1 Vide Sans. Lang. p. 259.

2 *kimaḥ kaḥ*, Pāṇ. 7.2.103.

3 *śuṣaḥ kaḥ*, ibid. 8.2.51.

4 properly *ki* (>*ki-m*).

5 Sans. Gram. para, 504.

6 *āgastya-kauṇḍinyayor agasti-kuṇḍinac*, Pāṇ. 2.4.70.

Kauṇḍinya and *Kuṇḍināḥ* being derived from *Kuṇḍina*, one cannot be regarded as the cause of the other by way of substitution of something (Please see *Agasti* above).

(xviii) *khyāñ*—for the root *cakṣ-* when certain suffixes follow.[1] Thus *ā+cakṣ- +tum=ā-khyā-tum.*

But *khyā-* as a separate root has been admitted by Pāṇini also.[2] Hence it is needless to assume a substitute *khyā* here for *cakṣ-*. The root *khyā-*, not *cakṣ-*, is to be admitted here.

(xix) *gami*—for the root *i-* when *-ṇic* or *-san* follows.[3] Thus *i- + ṇic + ti = gamayati ; i- +san+ti=jigamiṣati.*

But this is untenable. The above forms are clearly from the root *gam-*, not *i-*. The root *i-* is defective, its causative and desiderative forms being unavailable. The forms being from *gam-*, there is no question of a substitute *gam* for *i-*.

(xx) *gā*—for *i-* in its *luṅ* forms, *agāt, agātām, a-gus* etc.[4]

But this substitution is unnecessary. The forms are obviously derived from the root *gā-*(whence *gā-tu*, going, way ; *gā-tra*), which is clearly seen in the forms *ji-gā-ti, ja-gā-ti, gā-ti, gā-te* etc.[5]

(xxi) *ghana*—for *han-*[6]

But this is against comparative philology which has shown that not *gh* for *h*, but *h* for orig. *gh* has been substituted in Sanskrit.

(xxii) *ghasl*—for *ad-* under certain circumstances.[7] Thus *aghasat, jighatsati, ghāsa* etc. are regarded as coming from *ad-* by the substitution of *ghas.*

This is unacceptable. For the forms in question are from a root *ghas-*, not *ad-*, via a substitution. The root *ghas-* is recognised by Pāṇini too.[8] Hence the said forms need not go under *ad-*.

---

[1] *cakṣiṅaḥ khyāñ* ; *vā liṭi*, ibid. 2.4.54-55.

[2] Pāṇ. 3.1.52.

[3] *ṇau gamir abodhane* ; *sani ca* ; *iṅaś ca*, ibid. 2.4.46-48.

[4] *iṇo gā luṅi*, ibid. 2.4.45.

[5] Vide SED on *gā-*.

[6] *hanaś ca vadhaḥ* ; *mūrtau ghanaḥ* ; etc. Pāṇ. 3.3.76-83.

[7] *luṅ-sanor ghasl* ; *ghañ-apoś ca* ; *bahulaṁ chandasi* ; *liṭi anyatarasyām*, ibid. 2.4.37-40.

[8] *sṛ-ghasi-adaḥ kmarac*, Pāṇ. 3.2.160.

(xxiii) *jagdhi*—for *ad-* in *jagdha, jagdhvā* etc.[1]

It is difficult to see how *ad-* can give rise to forms with such different sounds. A different root, most probably *jakṣ-*, is responsible for them. Hence there is no question of substitution of *jagdhi* for *ad-*.

(xxiv) *dyāvā*—for *div* in *dyāvā-pṛthivyau* etc.[2]

But *dyāvā* is a regular Vedic dual from *div* (or *dyo*, according to Whitney),[3] and so it cannot be regarded as a substitute for *div* in a few cases.

(xxv) *dha*—for *h* of *nah-* in some cases : *naddha, naddhum* etc.[4] But this is against comparative philology which has shown that not *dh* for *h*, but *h* for *dh* (also *gh, bh*) has been substituted in Sanskrit. Therefore the root is in its right form in *naddha* etc. A substituted form exists in *saṁ-nāha, saṁ-nahya* etc.

(xxvi) *dhi*—for *-hi* in some imperative forms, *juhudhi* etc.[5]

But such substitution is against comparative philology and cannot be accepted (Please see above).

(xxvii) *na*—for *-kta* in *bhinna, lūna, pīna* etc.[6]

In such forms a suffix *-na* is to be admitted, which suffix is found also elsewhere in Indo-European ; cf. Skt. *pūr-ṇa*, L. *ple-nus*, Teut.[1] *fol-na** (whence Eng. *full* by Paul's law). Eng. past participle affix *-n* or *-ne* (as in *bor-n, bor-ne* etc.) is also the same.

Therefore *-na* need not be regarded as a mere substitute for *-kta*.

(xxviii) *niṅ*—for the stem-final in *jāyā* final in a *Bahu-vrīhi* compound.[7] Thus *yuva-jāni* (<*yuvati-jāyā*).

But *jāni* (also *jani*) occurs as an independent word in the sense of 'woman', 'wife' ; also cf. Gk. *gone* (woman). Hence the *-jāni* in the compound need not be derived from *jāyā* by substitution of *-ni*.

---

1 *ado jagdhir lyap-ti kiti*, ibid. 2.4.36.

2 *divo dyāvā*, ibid. 6.3.29.

3 Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 360e.

4 *naho dhaḥ*, Pāṇ. 8.2.34 :

5 *hu-jhalbhyo her dhiḥ*, ibid. 6.4.101.

6 *ra-dābhyāṁ niṣṭhāto naḥ pūrvasya ca ḍaḥ* ; etc., ibid. 8.2.42-50.

7 *jāyāyā niṅ*. Pāṇ. 5.4.134.

(xxix) *paśya*—for *dṛś*—in *sārvadhātuka lakāras.*[1], e.g., *paśyati, a-paśyat,* etc.

But the root *dṛś-* has nothing to do with these forms (*paśyati* etc.) which are obviously from a *divādi*-class root *paś-* which has a variant *spaś-*, as in *spaśa* (spy), *spaṣṭa* (clear, seen) etc. (=L. *spec-ere*, to see).

Hence *paśya* need not be a substitute for *dṛś-*. The verb *dṛś-* is defective. In *sārvadhātuka* cases the forms of *paś-* are used. But this does not make *paś*-forms *dṛś*-forms.

(xxx) *bhū*—for *as-* im *ārdhadhātuka* cases.[2] Thus *as-* + *liṭ a* = *babhūva ; as-* + *tum* = *bhavitum,* and so on.

But the above forms are actually from *bhū-*, not *as-*, which is a defective verb. Hence *as-* need not be connected with them through a substitution. Pāṇini did not like to recognise defective verbs, and this is why forms of other verbs are placed under the defective verbs. But such forms are immediately recognised and the substitution theory collapses.

(xxxi) *va*—for *-kta* in *pakva*[3].

But *-va* is to be recognised as an independent suffix, not a substitute for *-kta*. *-va* as a suffix is not unknown ; cf. *Keśa-va, yā-va* (*-yā* + *loṭ*) etc. Hence it deserves recognition here too.

(xxxii) *vaci*—for *brū-* in *vaktā, vaktum* etc.[4]

These forms are clearly from the root *vac-* (>*vakti, vacana* etc.), and there is no need of assuming any ādeśa *vac* for *brū-* to account for them.

(xxxiii) *vadha*—for *han-* in *a-vadhīt, vadhyāt, vadha* etc[5].

These forms are from the root *vadh-*, not *han*. So *vadha* need not be assumed as a substitute for *han-* to derive them from that root (*han-*).

(xxxiv) *śra*—for *pra-śasya* in *śreyas* and *śreṣṭha*[6].

According to Whitney these are from the root *śrī-*,[6] not *praśasya*. Hence the procedure *praśasya*> *śra*+*iṣṭha, īyas* is untenable. The suffixes

---

[1] *pā-ghrā-dhmā-sthā-mnā-dāṇ-dṛśi-arti-sarti-śada-sadāṁ piba-jighra-dhama-tiṣṭha-mana-yaccha-paśya-ṛccha-dhau-śīya-sīdāḥ*, ibid. 7.3.78.

[2] *aster bhūḥ*, Pāṇ. 2.4.52.

[3] *paco vaḥ*, Pāṇ. 8.2.52.

[4] *bruvo vaci*, ibid. 2.4.53.

[5] *hano vadha liṅi ; luṅi ca ; ātmanepadeṣu anyatarasyām*, ibid. 2.4.42-44.

[6] Sans Gram., para 470c.

-iṣṭha and *-īyas* are added to adjectives. But here (and also in some other cases, such as *tapiṣṭha*) they are used after a root. This could not be recognised. Hence an imaginary adjective *praśasya* is set up as the positive base, and then a substitute *śra* is assumed to stand for it, because *śra*+*īyas*, *iṣṭha* gives the required forms (*śreyas*, *śreṣṭha*).

(xxxv) *hṛd*—for *hṛdaya* in certain derivatives and compounds[1] such as *hṛdya*, *hārd-a*, *sauhārd-a* etc.

hṛd may be regarded as an independent stem ; cf. Eng. *heart* ; also cf. Skt. *śrad* (faith).

(xxxvi) *para-rūpa*[2]

para-rūpa has been treated as a case of substitution. But actually this is a case of elision. For in it the sound of the first word is dropped and that of the second stands. It could be said in such cases that the first vowel is elided or dropped, and nothing more was needed.

(xxxvii) *pūrva-rūpa*[3]

This is also called an *ādeśa*, but this too is a case of elision, for here the following sound is dropped but no other thing occurs besides.

34. *ĀDEŚA* AND *ĀGAMA* CONFUSED

Cases are not rare where *ādeśa* and *āgama* have been confused. This occurs when an *anekāl*[4] *ādeśa* replaces only one sound or a few sounds. Some examples are :

(i) *akaṅ* in place of *ṛ* in *sudhātṛ*[5] and the final *a* of *Vyāsa*, *niṣāda* etc.[6]

Now, in *akaṅ* there are two sounds (*a-k*) which are to come in place of the one at the end of *su-dhātṛ* etc.

su-dhātṛ > *sudhātak*

This *ak* is more than a substitute for *ṛ*. For actually *ṛ* is replaced by *a* (of *ak*), and *k* is then added as an extra sound. This is nothing but an *āgama*. Thus *ak*=*ādeśa*+*āgama*. But it is regarded only as *ādeśa*.

---

1 *hṛdayasya hṛt lekha-yad-aṇ-lāseṣu* ; *vā śoka-śyañ-rogeṣu*, Pāṇ. 6.3.50-51.

2 *eṅi para-rūpam*, ibid. 6.1.94.

3 *ami pūrvaḥ* ; *samprasāraṇāt ca* ; *eṅaḥ padāntād ati* ; *ṅasi-ṅasoś ca*, ibid. 6.1.107-110.

4 =consisting of more than one sound.

5 *sudhātur akaṅ ca*, Pāṇ. 4.1.97.

6 *Vyāsa-varuḍa-niṣāda-caṇḍāla-bimbānām iti vaktavyam* (Vārt. on the above).

(ii) *anaṅ* in place of *s* of *dhanus*[1]. *dhanu-s* > *-dhanu-an* (=*dhanv-an*). Here too *u* of *dhanus* has been replaced by *a* of *anaṅ* and then *n* has been added extra . Thus of *anaṅ a* is *ādesa* but *n* is *āgama*.

35. *ĀDEŚA* AND SUFFIX CONFUSED

Sometimes what is accepted as a suffix may be called an *ādeśa*. For example, the suffix *-iñ* (*i*) in *Ārjuni* etc. Here *-i* has come in place of the stem-final *a* : *Arjuna* > *Ārjuna* > *Ārjuni*. So it may well be called an *ādeśa*. But it is regarded as a suffix. As a way out of this difficulty, it has been held that before the addition of this and some other suffixes the stem-final *a*, *i* are elided.[2] That is to say, first the elision takes place, then the suffix comes. But these two events need not be viewed separately when both are occurring at the same time. The elision could be admitted as such if the matter ended there. But since something is coming also to fill the gap, the matter comprises both acts, and the totality is replacement or substitution (=*ādeśa*).

This fact is admitted elsewhere. For example, in *su-gandhi* (<*su-gandha*) the final *i* has come in the place of *a* (of *-gandha*), and is an *ādeśa*, and this is recognised by Pāṇini too. This is evident from the sixth case-ending in the sūtra : *gandhasya it ut-pūti-su-surabhibhyaḥ*[3].

Now, the change in both cases (*Ārjun-i*, *su-gandh-i*) is of the same type. Yet in one case it is called addition of suffix but in the other *ādeśa*. Thus *ādeśa* and suffix have been confused.

---

[1] *dhanuṣaś ca*, Pāṇ. 5.4.132.

[2] *yasyeti ca*, Pāṇ. 6.4.148.

[3] Pāṇ. 5.4.135.

ELISION (LOPA ETC.)

LAKṢAṆĀ MISINTERPRETED

PRIMARY SUFFIX REGARDED SECONDARY

UTTER SUFFIXLESSNESS NOT NOTED

WRONG SUFFIX

WRONG STEM

WRONG CASE-FORM

WRONG SAMĀSA

GENDERLESS MASCULINE NOT NOTED

CONCLUSION

In a number of cases the elisions admitted in Pāṇini are not facts. This will be evident from the following examples :

36. *LAKṢAṆĀ* MISINTERPRETED

(i) *-añ* —The suffix *-añ* is said to be elided from *Kamboja, Kerala, Coḷa, Śaka, Yavana*[1] etc.

These words are supposed to have *-añ* by the rule—*janapada-śabdat kṣatriyād añ*[2] (*-añ* is added to country-names, also meaning the Kṣattriyas of those countries, in the sense of a 'descendant').

The usual derivation of such words is like—*Kamboja+ añ*, minus *añ*.

But this is untenable. Neither the addition, nor the elision, of *-añ* is admissible here.

Actually these are words used in a secondary sense (*lakṣaṇā*) without a suffix being added. Hence the question does not arise of elision of the suffix.

The secondary sense without a suffix was obviously not recognised by Pāṇini and his successors. But this has since been recognised. In *Kaliṅgaḥ sāhasikaḥ, Kaliṅga* has a secondary sense but that is not derived from any suffix. *lakṣaṇā* is regarded as the cause of this sense. Similar is the case with the above words. No suffix but *lakṣaṇā* is the cause of their derivative meaning. Therefore there is no question of elision of a suffix in them.

But since *lakṣaṇā* was not recognised in Pāṇini's days, the secondary sense in the above words was accounted for by assuming a *taddhita* suffix in them, and the physical absence of the suffix is then attributed to its elision. But this is not the right interpretation.

cf. Eng. 'There comes Kent'[3] (=the Earl of Kent) ; 'Peace be with Burgandy'[3] (=Duke of Burgandy). No suffix is involved here. Similar is the case with the above Sanskrit words.

(ii) patronymic suffixes—This or that patronymic suffix is supposed to be elided from the following words :

---

[1] *kambojāl luk* ; *kambojādibhyo lug-vacanaṁ colādyartham*, Pāṇ. 4.1.175 and Vārt. on it..

[2] ibid. 4.1.168.

[3] From Shakespeare's King Lear.

Yaskāḥ, Gargāḥ, Vidāḥ, Atrayaḥ, Bhṛgavaḥ, Yudhiṣṭhirāḥ, Kuṇḍināḥ, Phāṇṭāhṛtāḥ etc.[1]

The case is the same as above. Not suffixes added and elided, but *lakṣaṇā* or use of words in a slightly different sense is operative here. (Please see the above section).

Also cf. Eng. 'The Barrets of Wimple Street'; 'The Smiths are invited'; etc., where a personal name in plur. is used to denote the family, but no suffix is concerned here.

(iii) affixes by *adhikṛtya kṛte granthe*[2] (i.e., when a book is composed about somebody)—

The affixes enjoined by the above sūtra are supposed elided[3] in a number of cases, such as—*Vāsavadattā, Sumanottarā, Urvaśī, Kādambarī* etc.

But these are also cases of *lakṣaṇā* or secondary use without a suffix[4]. Hence there is no question of elision of a suffix. (Please see No. i above).

(iv) *Cāturarthika* affixes (*aṇ* etc.)—

These suffixes are said to be elided in *Aṇgāḥ, Vaṇgāḥ, Pāñcālāḥ* etc[5].

But these too are cases of *lakṣaṇā* and hence there is no question of elision of a suffix. (Please see above),

(v) Affixes in the sense of *tatra jātaḥ*—

Such affixes are assumed to be elided in *tiṣya, Punar-vasu, gosthāna* etc.[6]

But in the case of the first two, *lakṣaṇā* is clear as in many other words noted above, and in the last word the compound can carry the intended sense. *Lakṣaṇā* may also be admitted. Thus there being no suffix concerned, there is no question of its elision here.

(vi) *-ṭhak*—The suffix *-ṭhak* is supposed elided from *lavaṇa*[7] (salty).

---

[1] *Yaskādibhyo gotre*; *bahvaca iñaḥ prācya-bharateṣu*; etc. Pāṇ. 2.4.58-70; 4.1.90.

[2] Pāṇ. 4.3.87.

[3] Vide Vārt. (on the above): *lub ākhyāyikābhyo bahulam.*

[4] From original personal name the sense of 'a book dealing with that person' can easily develop. The *prayojana* is brevity or economy.

[5] *janapade lup*, Pāṇ. 4.2.81.

[6] *śraviṣṭhā-phalgunī.....luk*; *sthānānta-gośāla-kharaśālāc ca*, ibid. 4.3.34-35.

[7] *lavaṇāl luk*, Pāṇ. 4.4.24.

But this is another case of *lakṣaṇā*. That is, *lavaṇa* (salt) here= *lavaṇa* (salty), and this changed sense is due to *lakṣaṇā*. There is no suffix concerned for addition or elision.

(vii) Suffixes after names of trees and plants—

These are supposed elided when the names denote their fruits, e.g., *harītakī, drākṣā, jāti, tila, badara* etc[1]. The derivation is like—*harītakī* (the fruit)=*harītakī* (the tree) +*a*, minus *a*.

This is unnecessary. Either this is a case of *lakṣaṇā* or both the 'tree' and the 'fruit' are to be regarded as the primary meanings of *harītakī* etc., it being not known which of the two got the name first.

37. PRIMARY SUFFIXES REGARDED SECONDARY

(viii) *-tṛ*—The suffix *-tṛ* is supposed elided in *kariṣṭha, vijayiṣṭha* etc[2].

But this is unnecessary.*-iṣṭha* and *-īyas* were suffixes of primary derivation[3]. So the forms are all right. But in Pāṇini they are regarded as suffixes of secondary derivation. So they cannot be added to roots. Therefore a suffix *-tṛ* is assumed elided from after the roots in the above words. This is only to uphold the theory (that these suffixes are of secondary derivation). But the theory is not well-founded, for more than a hundred instances are available in the Veda of this use (i.e., primary) of the suffixes. So many instances cannot be regarded as exceptions that can be explained away. These shake the very foundation of the theory.

(ix) *bahu*—supposed elided in *bhūyiṣṭha, bhūyas* and *bhūman*.[4]

But these words have nothing to do with *bahu*. They are from *bhū-*, to be : *bhū-* +(*ī*)*yas, iṣṭha*[5]. These suffixes at one time formed primary derivatives (whereof over hundred examples occur in the Veda)[6], and the above words are the results thereof. Also cf. Eng. *best* (<*be*=Skt. *bhū-* +*est*=Skt. *-iṣṭha*).

Hence no question of elision of *bahu* here.

(x) *-matup*—supposed elided in *srajiṣṭha, Vasiṣṭha* etc[7]. Thus *srajiṣṭha*=*sraj-*+*matup*+*iṣṭha*.

---

[1] *phale luk* ;.....*harītakyādibhyaś ca*, Pāṇ. 4.3.163-167.
[2] *tur iṣṭha-ima-īyassu*, Pāṇ. 6.4.154.
[3] Vide Whitney's Grammar, paras 467-468.
[4] *bahor lopo bhū ca bahoḥ*, Pāṇ. 6.4.158.
[5] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 470a.
[6] ibid., paras 467-468.
[7] *vin-mator luk*, Pāṇ. 5.3.65.

The case is the same as above. There is no *-matup* or its elision concerned here. (Please see the above sections, i.e., viii,-ix). Another explanation is also possible. *srajiṣṭha* may be=*sraj* (garland)+*iṣṭha*. For *-iṣṭha* etc. after nouns cf. *Go-tama, aśva-tara, ratnadhā-tama* etc.

(xi) *-vin*—This suffix is assumed elided, like *-matup*, in *srajiṣṭha* etc[1]. This is unnecessary. (Please see No. x above).

38. UTTER SUFFIXLESSNESS NOT NOTED

(xii) *-kvin, -kvip*—These suffixes are supposed elided in the words-*īdṛś, Vṛtra-han* etc[2].

Actually these are formations without a suffix[3]. But obviously Pāṇini does not like a formation involving a verbal root without a suffix. This is why these suffixes are first enjoined[4] and then regarded as elided. Thus the actual suffixlessness is maintained and a touch of the suffix also is declared.

The suffixes *-kvip, -kvin* etc. are always elided. Addition of such suffixes serves only to indicate that suffixlessness was not liked by Pāṇini in derivatives. But actual addition or elision of a suffix is not proved thereby. What is always elided is not added even when it is added, and what is not added cannot be available for elision either.

(xiii) *-ṇvi*—This suffix is assumed elided in *ardhabhāk, pāda-bhāk* etc.

But this, like *-kvip* etc., is a suffix which is always elided, that is, practically it is not added at all. Hence the question does not arise of its elision.

(xiv) *-su*—The elision of the ending *-su* is admitted in consonantal stems, fem. *ā-* and *ī-* stems etc.[4]; e.g., *vāk, nadī, latā* etc. (all nominative).

But these are actually endingless *padas*, and such things are found in Greek and Latin languages also. Hence there is no question of elision of an ending. (For further discussion please see the section on *pada*, Chap. III).

39. WRONG SUFFIX

(xv) *-am*—The elision of *a* of the *sup* ending *-am* (acc. sing.) in *naram, munim, sādhum* etc. is indirectly stated. The direct statement is that

---

[1] Pāṇ. 5.3.65 (quoted above).

[2] *ver apṛktasya*, Pāṇ. 6.1.67.

[3] These are called root-words or stems without suffix by Whitney (Vide *Sans. Gram.* paras 1147 etc.).

[4] *spṛśo'nudake kvin*; *sat-sū-dviṣa*.....; etc.; ibid. 3.2.58-61, 87-92.

[5] *hal-ṅī-ābbhyo dīrghāt su-ti-si-apṛktaṁ hal*, Pāṇ. 6.1.68. (For other *sūtras* vide the section on *Pada*, Chap. III).

when *-am* is added to such cases (*nara+am ; muni+am* etc.), there arises occasion for a *sandhi* and in the *sandhi* the former vowel stands[1]. This means the latter vowel belonging to the ending *-am* is elided.

But in reality neither is the ending *am*, nor any elision of *a* in such cases ; *naram=nara+m* ; *agnim=agni+m*, and so on. The ending is *m* (not *am*)[1]. "The termination appears as *-m* after vocalic stems, Skt. *aśva-m*, L. *equu-m ;* Skt. *agni-m*, L. *igne-m* etc." (Burrow)[2].

If the ending is admitted to be *-am* as is done in Pāṇini, then of course the *a* is somehow to be got rid of here. But what, after all, is the necessity of assuming such unreal[3] endings ? The acc. sing. ending is *-am* after consonantal stems, but it is *m* after the vocalic ones.

40. WRONG STEM

(xvi) *id—id-* of *idam* is said to be elided when endings beginning with a consonant follow[4]. Thus *idam+bhyām=ābhyām* ; *idam+bhyas=ebhyas*.

But these forms have nothing to do with *idam*. These are from a stem *a*. A number of stems including *a* are involved in the *idam*-declension, though traditionally all forms are known to be from *idam*. All modern scholars hold this view.

Hence the elision proposed is unacceptable.

(xvii) *n—n* is said to be elided from the negative particle *na* when it is compounded with a following member[5]. Thus *a-sādhu, a-dharma* etc. from *na-sādhu, na-dharma* etc.

But *a-* need not be the result of elision of *n* from *na* ; cf. Gk. *a-* in *a-gnostikos* (>Eng. *agnostic*) etc. *a-* is to be recognised as a separate particle. This particle, with a difference in meaning, appears as augment in the formation of the imperfect and the aorist. The particles *na* and *an-* (supposed to be fr. *na* by elision in of *n* and again addition of it)[6] also are found elsewhere in Indo-European ; cf. Gk. *ne-*, *an-*, L. *ne-*, *in-*, AS. *ne* (Eng. *no*), Goth. & G. *un*, Eng. *im-*, *un-*. Skt. *na*, *a-*, and *an-* being paralleled elsewhere

---

[1] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 307b, etc. ; *Sans. Lang.* p. 230.

[2] *Sans. Lang.* p. 230.

[3] With regard to vocalic stems except. *ṛ-* stems.

[4] *hali lopaḥ*, Pāṇ. 7.2.113.

[5] *na-lopo nañaḥ*, Pāṇ. 6.3.73.

[6] By *na-lopo nañaḥ, tasmān nuḍ aci*, Pāṇ. 6.3.73-74.

in Indo-European, all these are to regarded as independent particles. *a-* (also *an-*), therefore, need not be derived from *na* by the elision of *n*.

The compounds *nāti-* (*na*+*ati*), *na-ga*, *na-saṁhata* etc.

The compounds *nāti-* (*na ati*) *na-ga*, *na-saṁhata* etc., where *na* remains intact, also show that *a-*, *an-* in compounds are not derived from *na*.

Whitney calls them (*a-*, *an-*) 'negative prefix.'[1]

41. WRONG CASE-FROM

(xviii) *v*—The semi-vowel *v* is supposed elided in such combinations (*sandhi*) as *dvā atra*, *ravā udite* etc. (<*dvāvatra*<*dvau atra* etc.).

But this need not be the case. *dvā* (besides *dvau*), *ravā* (besides *ravau*) etc. are independent forms, and the above combinations may come from these forms as well : *dvā*+*atra*=*dvā atra* ; *ravā*+*udite*=*ravā udite*.

As to the question why *dvā*+*atra* etc. should not contract to *dvātra* etc. it may be pointed out that as the long vowels *ī*, *ū*, *e* of the dual, *e* in *asme* and *yuṣme* and vowels in some other cases are not admitted to *sandhi*, so the *ā*, alternating with *au* in declensional forms, is also probably excluded from *sandhi*.

42. WRONG *SAMĀSA*

(xix) *-kha*—The suffix *-kha* is regarded as elided in Dvigu compounds with *varṣa* final, such as *dvi-varṣa*[2].

But there is no neccessity of such a suffix here. The admission of Bahuvrīhi compound is enough to bring home the sense : *dve varṣe yasya* = *dvi-varṣa*. Hence no question of elision.

(xx) *prāg-dīvyatīya* suffixes—supposed elided in *pañca-kapāla*, *daśa-kapāla*, *dvi-Veda*, *tri-Veda* etc[3]., regarded as *Dvigu* compounds.

But there is no neccessity of a suffix in these words. The admission of Bahuvrīhi compound is enough to carry the intended sense. Hence no question of elision of a suffix

43. GENDERLESS MASCULINE NOT NOTED

(xxi) fem. affixes—These are supposed elided[4] in (i) *kumārāyate*, *śvetāyate* etc. (ii) *mṛga-kṣīra*, *kukkuṭāṇḍa* etc. (iii) *yatra*, *tatra*, *yataḥ*,

---

[1] *Sans. Gram.*, para 1121a.

[2] *varṣālluk ca*, Pāṇ. 5.1.88.

[3] *dvigor lug anapatye*, Pāṇ. 4.1.88.

[4] The elision of fem. suffixes is called *puṁvad-bhāva* (=being like masculine).

tataḥ when used in the sense of *yasyām, tasyām* (fem.) etc. (iv) *hāstikam* (v) *bhavadīya* etc.[1]

It is needless to assume the elision of a fem. suff. in such formations. These are properly masculine forms or forms of general use without reference to sex. Feminine forms are not always made in actual language. Masculine forms are used for feminine also. Or the masculine form is regarded as the general form applicable to all genders. Gender is not felt in that. This representative character of the masculine gender is admitted by Pāṇini too in the *ekaśeṣa* rules[2]. That the masculine form alone survives in such cases, but expresses the sense of the feminine also clearly shows the use of the masculine as a general form.

Further, the gender is little attended to in beasts and birds, and thus one may say—*vyāghrād bibheti, aśvo dhāvati, pakṣī kūjati*, etc. without noting the sex of the creature, or even knowing that it is a female. Thus the masculine gender remains a representative gender or general gender.

This being the case *mṛga-kṣīram* etc. need not be explained as *mṛgyāḥ* (fem.) *kṣīram* etc. It may well be *mṛgasya kṣīram*, where *mṛgasya*=of the species called 'deer' (not 'of the male deer'). This interpretation seems better in view of the following : *mṛgyāḥ kṣīram* has a subtle indication that there may be also *mṛgasya kṣīram*[3] (male deer's milk) which is impossible. That milk is available from the female creatures alone is known to all. Therefore it is not the gender, but the species, of the milk-giving animal, that is required to be known. And so only the species is expressed by the expressions—Eng. *goat's milk, buffalo's milk*, Beng. *garu-r dudh, mahiṣ-er dudh*, Hindi *bhais kā dūdh* etc. Expressions like *she-goat's milk, she-buffalo's milk* are never used. Yet everybody understands from which sex the milk is coming.

Skt. *mṛga-kṣīra, kukkuṭāṇḍa* etc. are like expressions, where *mṛga* etc. are used as mere names of the species, and hence no feminine affix is pertinent there.

Hāstika, bhavadīya, kumārāyate etc., though masculine in form, may be regarded as applied to feminine also, because the necessary feminine forms not made for some reason or other. One obvious reason is avoidance of

---

[1] Vide Pāṇ. 6.3.35 (with Vārt.), 36,42 (*kyaṅ-māninoś ca* ; *puṁvat karmadhāraya-jātīya-deśīyeṣu* etc.).

[2] *pumān striyā* ; *bhrātṛ-putrau svasṛ-duhitṛbhyām* ; *pitā mātrā* ; *śvaśuraḥ śvaśrvā*, Pāṇ. 1. 2.67-68, 70-71.

[3] =The milk of a male deer.

feminine forms and preference for the masculine, which has found expression in the *ekaśeṣa* rules noted above[1].

kumāra iva ācarati=kumārāyate
kumārī iva ācarati=nil
hastināṁ samūhaḥ=hāstikam
hastinīnāṁ samūhaḥ=nil
bhavata idam=bhavadīyam
bhavatyāḥ idam=nil.

In each case the form for the masculine is clearly deputed to the feminine cases also. Were it not so, and if the feminine forms had actually been made, why should the fem. affix fall away ? What purpose is served by adding the fem. suffix and at once dropping it ?

This deputation of the masculine forms is possible owing to the representative character of the masculine gender, already noted.

Similar is the case with *yataḥ*, *tataḥ* etc. where the masc. stems *ya-*, *ta-*, in their aforesaid representative capacity[2], can denote the feminine also.

Thus no elision of a fem. suff. is involved in the above formations.

44. CONCLUSION

Above are the cases of supposed elision, where actually no elision takes place, because there is nothing to be elided in them. The suffixes that are supposed to have been added in such cases are, in reality, not added at all ; hence there is no question of their elision. For example, in nom. sing. *nadī* no *-su* is added, and therefore the question does not arise of its elision. Thus what Pāṇini thinks elision (*lopa* etc.) in such cases is actually non-addition of suffix.

Now, it may be argued that this non-addition itself is meant by Pāṇini by his terms *lopa*, *luk* etc. (=elision). That is to say, when Pāṇini says there is *lopa* etc. of such and such sounds, it is to be understood that such sounds are not added or not seen in the words in question. So there is nothing to be said against Pāṇini here.

But there is little room for such an argument. Pāṇini does not mean non-addition of suffix by *lopa* etc. For (i) if non-addition was intended by Pāṇini by *lopa* etc., then why did he not state the fact directly by using the

---

[1] cf. Hindi *ham jāte*, *āte* etc. used by ladies also.

[2] This privilege, granted to the masc. gender, is doubtless due to the fact that the male sex itself has been a privileged class all along.

negative particle *na*, as is done in many other cases ? For example, there is the sūtra *na ṣaṭ-svasrādibhyaḥ*[1], which is a direct statement of the fact of non-addition of fem. affixes to such bases as *pañcan ṣaṣ, svasṛ, duhitṛ* etc. (i.e. fem. affixes are not added to *pañcan* etc.). There are many more such sūtras where non-addition of suffix is stated by the negative particle *na*[2]. Similar direct statements with *na* should have been made with regard to the words at issue, i.e. *nadī, latā* (nom. sing.), *lavaṇa* (=salty) etc., to express non-addition of suffix, if non-addition was really intended. Since the statements in their case are made otherwise, i.e., made with the terms *lopa, luk* etc., it is of course to be understood that in such cases Pāṇini does not intend non-addition, but actual elision or dropping of an added suffix. (ii) Besides, the admission of non-addition of suffix is not possible either for Pāṇini. For without admitting a suffix he cannot explain the change of meaning in many words, such as *Vaṅgāḥ, lavaṇa, Vāsavadattā* (in the senses of people of *Vaṅga*, salty, the book respectively)[3], and his theories *sup-tiṅ-antaṁ padam*[4] and *prātipadikārtha.....mātre prathamā*[5] collapse, if suffix is not admitted in *nadī* (nom. sing.) etc. He does not recognise *lakṣaṇā* and *sup*-less *padas*.

Hence the necessity does exist for a criticism as is done in the above pages.

---

[1] Pāṇ. 4.1.10.

[2] ibid. 4.2.113 ; 4.3.130 etc. (*na dvyacaḥ prācya-bharateṣu* etc.).

[3] The original senses are : the country Vaṅga, salt and the maiden of that name.

[4] Pāṇ. 1.4.14.

[5] ibid. 2.3.46:

COMPOUNDS (SAMĀSA)

LIMIMATIONS OF SAMĀSA HOW FAR JUSTIFIED
SAHA-SUPĀ NOT A CLASS OF COMPOUND

45. LIMITATIONS OF SAMĀSA—HOW FAR JUSTIFIED

What, after all, is the necessity of so many sūtras detailing cases of *samāsa* when the great principle *samarthaḥ pada-vidhiḥ*[1] is already there ? This can only mean that even all *samartha* cases are not admissible to *samāsa*. This is an undue restriction ; and writers of eminence have often gone beyond this restriction as will be evident from the subjoined examples. Again, if these rules were to be laid down at all, then there was no point in stating the *samartha-sūtra*. It cannot be said that without this the undesirable compounding of *Kṛṣṇam* and *śritaḥ* could not be avoided in *paśyati Kṛṣṇaṁ, śrito Devadattam*. For it is innate in men not to connect unconnected words in their speech.

It is natural to expect all *samartha* (capable) cases to be admitted to compounds ; for that serves the end of *samāsa*. It is the brevity of expression that is the ultimate end of *samāsa*. If, however, *samāsa* is restricted to a number of fixed cases, that end is thereby defeated. This has happened in Pāṇini.

If it is said that the cases of *samāsa* noted in Pāṇini were the only ones obtaining in the language, and therefore this is a statement of facts, and there is no question of any undue restriction, then it must be admitted that more cases of *samāsa* are allowable if they are so capable, even though they are not listed in the sūtras. If this is not admitted, then the sūtras are, of course, undue limitations to *samāsa*. But this is virtually admitted. For a number of irregular cases are sought to be justified by *yoga-vibhāga* and the rule *saha supā*.

Therefore limitations of *samāsa* to those available from the sūtras cannot be insisted upon. More cases are possible, and they are also to be recognised.

Some of the possible cases[2] are :

(i) *dvitīyā tatpuruṣa*

---

[1] Pāṇ. 2.1.1, which means—*samāsas* take place between *samartha* or capable words.

[2] The cases cited here are all actually occurring in literature.

(*a*) *yogārūḍha :*

ā-rurukṣur muner yogaṁ
karma kāraṇam ucyate,
yogārūḍhasya tasyaiva
śamaḥ kāraṇam ucyate.

—G[1].

yadā hi nendriyārtheṣu
na karmasvanu-sajyate,
sarva-saṁkalpa-sannyāsī
yogārūḍhas tadocyate.

—ibid.[2]

According to Monier Williams[3] the compound occurs also in Nṛs-P-Up.

Yogārūḍha is not available under the Pāṇinian rules for *dvitīyā tatpuruṣa.*

(*b*) Also there are the compounds—*aśvārūḍha, rathārūḍha* etc.

(*c*) *vanādhivāsin* :

vi-śaṅkamāno bhavataḥ parābhavaṁ
nṛpāsanastho'pi vanādhivāsinaḥ.....

—Kirāt.[4]

Mallinātha has sought to avoid *dvitīyā tatpuruṣa* here, but if *grāma-gāmī* is regarded as *dvitīyā tat.*, there is no reason why *vanādhivāsin* should not be.

(*d*) *stoka-namrā stanābhyām.* (Megh).[5]

Here *kriyā-viśeṣaṇe dvitīyā* has been compounded.

(ii) *tṛtīyā tatpuruṣa*

(*a*) with *kṛtya* not in the sense of *adhikārthavacana*[6] *:*

vīra-bhogyā vasundharā ;
āśrame sarva-bhogye

—Śak.[7]

---

[1] G. 6.3.
[2] ibid. 6.4.
[3] Vide SED.
[4] Kirāt. 1.7.
[5] Megh. 84.
[6] *kṛtyair adhikārtha-vacane*, Pāṇ. 2.1.33.
[7] Śak. 2.15.

(*b*) with *hetu-tṛtīyā* :

vidyā-mado dhana-madas-
tṛtīyo'bhi-jana-madaḥ.

—MBh.

also *viraha-vidhurā* (Megh[1]) etc. *Samāsas* with *hetu-tṛtīyā* abound in literature.

(*c*) with *prakṛtyādi-tṛtīyā* :

kāmārthā hi prakṛti-kṛpaṇāś-
cetanācetaneṣu.

—ibid.[2]

Also *jāti-brāhmaṇa*,[3] *nāma-nau*,[4] *līlāvadhūta*,[5] *prakṛti-subhaga*[6] etc.

(*d*) with *savarṇa*, *sanātha* :

tvayyārūḍhe śikharam acalaḥ
snigdha-veṇī-savarṇe.

—Megh.[7]

tvat-sanāthe gavākṣe

—ibid.[8]

Samāsa with *sadṛśa* and *sama* only are allowed[9].

(*e*) with *apavarge tṛtīyā* :

kṣaṇa-bhaṅgin :
sāpāyāḥ kṣaṇa-bhaṅginya
evaṁ-prāyā vibhūtayaḥ.

—Rājat.[10]

The compound occurs also in Kathās.[11]

Also *kṣaṇa-bhaṅgura*, *kṣaṇa-vidhvaṁsin*, *varṣa-kṛtya* (to be completed in a year[12]) etc.

---

[1] Megh. 8.
[2] ibid. 5.
[3] Vide Tāṇḍ. 6.5.8. (commentary); Mbhāṣ.-kārikā on Pāṇ. 2.2.6 (*tapaḥ-śrutābhyāṁ yo hīno jāti-brāhmaṇa eva saḥ*).
[4] Vide SED on *nāma*.
[5] Megh. 1.35.
[6] ibid. 1.40.
[7] ibid. 1.18.
[8] ibid. 2.37.
[9] *pūrva-sadṛśa-sama-ūnārtha-kalaha-nipuṇa-miśra-ślakṣṇaiḥ*, Pāṇ. 2.1.31.
[10] Rājat. 4.388.
[11] Kathās. 25.163.
[12] Vide SED.

(iii) *caturthī tatpuruṣa*

(*a*) *aśva-ghāsa* etc.

These are regarded as *ṣaṣṭhī-samāsa* by the Bhāṣyakāra.[1] But the possessive sense is hardly justifiable there. *Aśva-ghāsa* is not 'grass of a horse' but 'grass for a horse'. The grass is not owned by the horse, but by the horse-keeper. Similarly *dharma-patnī* does not mean 'wife of *dharma*', but 'wife for *dharma*'. Hence *aśvāya ghāsaḥ, dharmāya patnī* etc. should be the proper exposition of such compounds, and *caturthī* their class.

(*b*) *śaraṇāgata* (come for refuge[2])

(*c*) *snāna-śāṭī*[3] (a bathing śāḍī), *pāka-śālā, bhojana-gṛha, bhojana-bhāṇḍa* etc. These occur in literature. Hence the objection of the commentators that *randhanāya sthālī* etc. cannot be compounded cannot stand.

(*d*) *upa-bhoga-kṣama* (Śak.);
kṛtyākṣama (Rājat.[4]).

(iv) *pañcamī tatpuruṣa*

(*a*) with *anya, itara: dvijetara, brāhmaṇetara, savyetara, tad-anya* etc.

tat-sādṛśyam a-bhāvaś ca
tad-anyatvaṁ tad-alpatā.

Also *tvad-anya* (G.[5]).

(*b*) with *trasta, trātṛ: bhaya-trasta, bhaya-trātṛ.*[6] In Pāṇini *apatrasta* has been listed, but not *trasta.*

---

[1] On Pān. 2.1.36. Kātyāyana, however, recognises *caturthī-samāsa* here (.....*aśva-ghāsādīnām upasaṁkhyānam*). But Bhāṣyakāra has rejected his view (*yad apyucyate aśva-ghāsādīnām upa-saṁkhyānaṁ kartavyam iti, na kartavyam. aśva-ghāsādayaḥ ṣaṣṭhī-samāsā bhaviṣyanti.* Mbhās. on Pāṇ. 2.1.36).

[2] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 1265a.

[3] *snāna-śāṭim upānayat.* MBh.

[4] Rājat. 8. 1595

[5] G. 6. 39.

[6] Cāṇ. etc. (Vide SED on *bhaya*).

(*c*) with *bhraṣṭa, cyuta :*

śucīnāṁ śrīmatāṁ gehe
yoga-bhraṣṭo'bhijāyate. —G.[1]

sadyaḥ kaṇṭha-cyuta-bhuja-latā-
granthi gāḍhopagūḍham. —Megh.[2]

(*d*) with *upa-gata, vi-mukha, parāṅmukha :*

stanita-vi-mukha —Megh.[3] ;

garjita-parāṅ-mukha —Malli. on above ;

kāntodantaḥ suhṛd-upagataḥ
saṅgamāt kiñcid-ūnaḥ. —Megh.[4]

etc.

(v) *ṣaṣṭhī tatpuruṣa*

(*a*) with *nirdhāraṇa-ṣaṣṭhī : narottama, puruṣottama, dvija-śreṣṭha* etc.

The contention of some that the *ṣaṣṭhī* here is *śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī* is hardly supportable. For how can there be the relation of '*śeṣa*' between a noun and an adjective ? That relation exists between a noun and a noun. Obviously, the *ṣaṣṭhī* here is *nirdhāraṇe*, though the *nirdhāryamāṇa* may not be present here. The *nirdhāryamāṇa* is understood in such cases. As soon as the word *puruṣottama* is heard, everyone understands that the god who is the highest of all beings is spoken of. But no such meaning, as 'the best one belonging to the *puruṣas*' (*puruṣāṇām uttamaḥ*) is taken. Hence there is no question of *śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī*.

(*b*) with *pūraṇa :*

uñcha-ṣaṣṭhāṅkita-saikatāni —Ragh.[5]

---

[1] G. 6. 41.

[2] Megh. 2. 36

[3] loc. cit.

[4] ibid. 2. 39. Mallinātha's exposition is *suhṛdā upagataḥ*, which is clearly unsatisfactory. For the *tṛtīyā* becomes indefensible. Neither *kartā*, *karaṇa*, nor *hetu* is suitable.

[5] Ragh. 5. 8.

Again, compounds like *bhikṣā-dvitīya* etc. have been allowed to occur by an *anyatarasyām* in the sūtra 2.2.3.[1] Therefore the prohibition of *ṣaṣṭhī-samāsa* with *pūraṇa* by *pūraṇa-guṇa* etc.[2] loses much of its force, and the compounds like the above (*uñcha-ṣaṣṭha*) may be the result thereof. The attempt by some to prove that here *ṣaṣṭha* is not a *pūraṇa* word does not deserve serious notice, because in that case there will be no *pūraṇa* word at all.

(*c*) with *guṇa :*

artha-kārśya, artha-gaurava, Bhāgavata-māhātmya etc. Even Pāṇini himself has '*saṁjñā-pramāṇatva*'.[3] From this Bhaṭṭojī has remarked that the prohibition with regard to *guṇa* is not binding[4]. But compounds with *guṇa* are so numerous that the prohibition is practically restricted to the few stock examples only.[5]

(*d*) with *-kta* in the present tense :

kutas tvā kaśmalam idaṁ
viṣame samupasthitam,
anārya-juṣṭam asvargyam
akīrti-karam Arjuna. —G.[6]

Here *anārya-juṣṭam=anāryair yad juṣyate.*

rāja-rakṣitāni tapo-vanāni. —Śak.[7]

(=the penance-groves are protected by the king)

That *-kta* in *juṣṭa, rakṣita* etc. is often in the present tense is admitted by the Bhāṣyakāra.[8]

---

[1] *evaṁ tarhi anyatarasyāṁ-grahaṇa-sāmarthyāt ṣaṣṭhī-samāso'pi bhaviṣyati.* (Mbhāṣ. on Pāṇ. 2.2.3).

[2] Pāṇ. 2.2.11.

[3] Pāṇ. 1.2.53.

[4] "*anityo' yaṁ guṇena niṣedhaḥ.*, SK. on Pāṇ. 2.2.11.

[5] These are : *kākasya kārṣṇyam, valākāyāḥ śauklyam, kaṇṭakasya taikṣṇyam, Brāhmaṇasya śuklāḥ vṛṣalasya kṛṣṇāḥ.*

[6] G. 2.2.

[7] Śak. Act I.

[8] *śīlito rakṣitaḥ śānta ākruṣṭo juṣṭa ityapi.....* etc. (Mbhās. on *mati-buddhi* etc. Pāṇ. 3.2. 188).

(*e*) with *karma ubhaya-prāptau*

payaḥ-pānaṁ bhujaṅgānāṁ
kevalaṁ viṣa-vardhanam.[1]

Devi, Devi, ayaṁ paścimas te Rāmasya śirasi pāda-paṅkaja-sparśaḥ. —Uttar.[2]

(*f*) with *-tṛc* and *-aka :*

tri-bhuvana-vi-dhātṛ, senā-pra-ṇetṛ, senābhigoptṛ, Veda-pāṭhaka, daṇḍa-nāyaka, daṇḍa-dhāraka, uttara-dāyaka, kartavya-niṣeddhṛ etc.

sa eva nṛpater abhūt
tadāpyucita-kartavya-
niṣeddhā daṇḍa-nāyakaḥ. —Rājat.[3]

Some admit *śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī* in these cases.[4] But it is not proper to assume *śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī* everywhere. If it is a case of *śeṣa*, then enjoining of *ṣaṣṭhī* by *kartṛ-karmaṇoḥ kṛti*[5] was unnecessary.

(vi) *saptamī tatpuruṣa*

(*a*) with *-kta :*

caraṇa-patita, samara-patita, saikata-līna, svapna-labdha, viṣayāsakta, avyaktāsakta etc.[6]

In Pāṇini only parts of day and night in *spatamī* are allowed to be compounded with *-kta*.[7] The above compounds are not available from the *pātre-samita* group of words, though that is an *ākṛti-gaṇa*, for words of that *gaṇa* carry a sense of censure (*kṣepa*).

(vii) *Tatpuruṣa* with *saṁkhyā*

Pāṅini has allowed such compounds only in *saṁjñā* (appellation).[8] But Patañjali has *tri-saṁśayāḥ*,[9] though no *saṁjñā* is intended. This

---

[1] Hit. 3.4

[2] Uttar. Act I

[3] Rājat. 7. 1599

[4] Says Bhaṭṭojī : *kathaṁ tarhi ghaṭānāṁ nirmātus tribhuvanavidhātuś ca kalaha iti ? śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhyā samāsa iti kaiyaṭaḥ* (Sk. on Pāṇ. 2.2.15).

[5] Pāṇ. 2.3.65

[6] Occurring in Megh. Sāk. Sāh. etc.

[7] Pāṇ. 2.1.45 (*ktena ahorātrāvayavāḥ*). The compounds of *tatra* and *-kta* (2.1.46) and *aluk* compounds *bhasmani-hutam* etc. (2.1.47) are a few exceptions.

[8] *dik-saṁkhye saṁjñāyām*, Pāṇ. 2.1.50

[9] *tri-saṁśayāstu bhavanti—prāpte, aprāpte, ubhayatra veti*—Mbhāṣ. on Pāṇ. 1.1.43.

shows that *saṁkhyā* can be compounded even outside *saṁjñā*. Patañjali, however, is silent on the sūtra[1] (i.e., no Bhāṣya is written on it). Anyway, prohibition of compound with *saṁkhyā* is a great inconvenience.

These are some of the examples, actually occurring in literature, of un-Pāṇinian *samāsa*. Many more such, though not recorded in any text, are possible, and if formed, will be acceptable like those cited. These show that enumeration of *samāsa*s, or restriction of *samāsa*s to fixed cases, is making the field of *samāsa* too narrow, and is unjustifiable. Such restriction stands in the way of facile composition, deprives the language of variety and liveliness, leads it through stereotyped channels alone, and makes one unduly dependent on grammar. For example, *yogād bhraṣṭaḥ* can be reasonably compounded into *yogabhraṣṭaḥ ;* but because of the many restrictions to *samāsa* laid down in grammar, one cannot all at once form this compound, but has to consult the grammar, only to find that this is not allowed. Therefore it is better if *samāsa* is allowed in all *samartha* cases, and not certain cases only, and this view is backed by actual usage in literature, as is shown above.

46. SAHA-SUPĀ NOT A CLASS OF COMPOUND

The un-Pāṇinian compounds instanced above (*yogabhraṣṭa* etc.) have not escaped the notice of post-Pāṇinian grammarians, and hence efforts have been made to defend them as Pāṇinian. These compounds are thrown into a separate class called *saha-supā* (or *sup-supā*) on the strength of the sūtra *saha supā*. Says Patañjali[2]—

> '*supā ca saha sup samasyate. adhikāraś ca lakṣaṇaṁ ca. yasya samāsasya anya-lakṣaṇaṁ nāsti, idaṁ tasya lakṣaṇaṁ bhaviṣyati*'.

But *saha-supā* cannot be admitted as a separate class of compounds approved by Pāṇini. Patañjali's statement (quoted above) also cannot be accepted as authoritative here for lack of sufficient reason. How can *saha supā* sūtra be a complete *lakṣaṇa ?* This gives only a general characteristic (*lakṣaṇa*) of compounds, that the members of a compound are *subanta* (inflected) words. There are, in addition, many special characteristics pertaining to each variety of compounds, which are detailed in the subsequent sūtras.[3] A valid compound is to have both these characteristics. A compound violating the special rules, and agreeing with the general principle

---

[1] *dik-saṁkhye saṁjñāyām*, Pāṇ. 2.1.50.

[2] Mbhāṣ. on the sātra *saha supā*, ibid. 2.1.4.

[3] *avyaṁ vibhakti-samīpa.....; yathā 'sādṛśye ; dvitīyā śritātīta.....* ; etc. Pāṇ. 2.1.6—2.2.38.

only cannot be valid in the opinion of Pāṇini, though such validity is claimed by Patañjali. For what was the necessity of framing so many special rules, if only *saha supā* could be the *lakṣaṇa* of a *samāsa* ? The existence of these sūtras mean that not all the *saha supā* cases, but only those portions of them which are covered by the special rules are admissible to *samāsa*. In these sūtras enumeration has been made of all the cases of *samāsa* valid in the view of Pāṇini. Therefore a *samāsa* outside this circle cannot be valid according to the Sūtrakāra. Had he said anywhere that the listed samāsas were only some examples, and more might be made like them, then *saha-supā samāsa*s could be made. But no such statement is there. Thus there is no justification for the statement of the Bhāṣyakāra that *saha-supā* is the name of those compounds which are not formed by the special rules.

It may be argued that *saha-supā* as a class of *samāsa* should be admitted on the authority of the Bhāṣyakāra, though not of the Sūtrakāra. This is not possible, because as soon as it is admitted, all the special rules for *samāsa* cease to be necessary, for *saha-supā* covers all the cases covered by them, too. Then the study of those sūtras becomes meaningless. But actually this has not occurred. This special rules have retained their utility all throughout. It is these rules by which a given compound is tested, but not by *saha supā*. It is only when the special rules cannot defend a compound that *saha supā* is resorted to. Thus *saha supā* remains a Cinderella among the *samāsa* rules. How can it be said to be a recognised class of *samāsa* ?

Again, judging some *samāsas* by the special rules and some by the general rule (*saha supā*) is a discrimination, an application of double standard, and hence unacceptable. One is to go, and that is *saha supā*, the rarely applied one. *Saha supā* is not a class of *samāsa*, but a principle of *samāsa*.

All *samāsa*s are *sapa-supā ;* how can there be a separate *sapa-supā* class of *samāsa ?*

DECLENSION

SUP-ENDINGS NOT UNIVERSALLY APPLICABLE

UN-PĀṆINIAN CASE-FORMS

47. *SUP*-ENDINGS NOT UNIVERSALLY APPLICABLE

In Pāṇini all the declensional forms of all stems are made out of the twenty-one case-endings *su, jas* etc. (known as *sup*) through a tedious process. But actually these endings are not applicable to all stems. They are mainly applied to the consonantal stems. The following ending-by-ending examination will make it clear :

-su—This is the nom. sing. ending of the Pāṇinian scheme. But this ending is never added to the consonantal stems, fem. *ā*- and *ī*- stems, *ṛ*-stems, and all neuter stems ; e.g., *rājan—rājā* ; *vac—vāk ; kanyā—kanyā ; nārī—nārī ; pitṛ—pitā ; mātṛ—mātā ;* (Neut.) *phalam, vāri, madhu* etc.

-au—nom. du. ending. It is not added to *i*- and *u*- stems, fem. *ā*-stems, *yuṣmad, asmad, adas,* and neut. stems ; e.g. *munī, sādhū, late, yuvām, āvām, amū ;* (neut.) *phale, madhunī* etc.

-jas—nom. plur. ending. Not added to numerals from *pañcan* to *daśan,* the pronouns and neut. stems; e.g., *pañca, ṣaṭ, sapta, aṣṭa. aṣṭau, nava, daśa, ekādaśa, sarve, vayam, yūyam* etc. ; (neut.) *phalāni, mahdūni* etc.

The fem. *ā*-stem may be added to the list ; e.g. *kanyā*>*kanyās,* where only *s* (not *as*) is noticeable as ending ; cf. Vedic nom. plur. *devī-s,* which type appears also in the Purāṇas ; e.g.,

tīre nyasya dukūlāni
vi-jahruḥ siñcatīr mithaḥ.

—Bhāg.[1]

-am—acc. sing. ending. Not added to *a*-stems (masc. & neut.), *ī*—stems, *ū*-stems, and also *ā*-stems (masc. and fem.). In these cases the ending is simply *m* (not *am*)[2] ; e.g., *nara-m, muni-m, sādhu-m, latā-m, nadī-m* etc.

-auṭ—acc. du. ending. Not added to stems which do not take *-au* (nom. du.). (Please see *-au* above).

-śas—acc. plur. ending. Not added to vowel stems and a number of consonantal stems ; e.g., *narān, munīn, latā-s, nadī-s, phalāni, pañca, ṣaṭ, tān, asmān* etc.

---

[1] Bhāg. 9.18.8

[2] Vide Whitney's Grammar, paras 327b, 336b, 363b.

-ṭā—inst. sing. ending. Not added to *a*-stems and a number of pronominal stems (masc. & neut.) ; e.g., *nareṇa, phalena, tena, anena* etc.

-bhis—instr. plur. ending. Not taken by *a* -stems and some pronouns in post-Vedic Sanskrit ; e.g., *narais, phalais, yais, tais* etc., where not *-bhis* but *-is* is added.

-ṅe—dat. sing. ending. Not taken by *a* -stems, *yuṣmad* and *asmad ;* e.g., *narāya, phalāya, tubhyam, mahyam.*

-ṅasi, -ṅas—abl. gen. sing. endings. Not taken by *a* -stems and a number of other vowel stems and pronominal stems ; e.g., *narāt, narasya ; phalāt, phalasya ; agne-s, sādho-s, nadyās ; tasmāt, tasya ; mat, mama ; tvat, tava* etc.

-ṅi—loc. sing. ending. Not taken by a number of vowel stems and the pronominal stems excepting *asmad* and *yuṣmad ;* e.g., *agnau, sādhau, nadyām, tasmin* etc.

From the examples given with every ending above, it is clear that endings other than those included in *sup* occur in a large number of cases. These endings are as good as the *sup* and should be recognised. But this is not the case. All these endings are sought to be made out of the *sup* endings through various processes. This makes declension difficult. Some examples may be noted :

(1) *naram*—Obviously this is=*nara*+*m*. But the Pāṇinian process of declension is : *nara*+*am*. The *sandhi* should result in *narām*, but one *a* (the latter) is then supposed dropped.[1] But this is against the regular *sandhi* rule. What is the justification of admitting such a *sandhi* here ?

(2) *narān*—*nara*+*ān*. But in Pāṇini the procedure is : *nara*+*śas* (=*as*). Then the final *s* of *śas* is supposed to be replaced by *n*.[2]

(3) *narābhyām*—*nara*+*ā-bhyām*.

Pāṇinian procedure : *nara*+*bhyām ;* then lengthening of the final vowel of the stem.[3] Such lengthening is admitted also in conjugational forms like *bhavāmi, bhavāvas* etc.[4] But again in

---

[1] *ami pūrvaḥ*, Pāṇ. 6.1.107.

[2] *tasmāt śaso naḥ puṁsi*, Pāṇ. 6.1.103.

[3] *supi ca* ,ibid. 7.3.102.

[4] *ato dīrgho yañi*, ibid. 7.3.101.

loṭ forms *bhavāni* etc. the *ā* (in *-āni* etc.) is said to be an augment.[1] This is a discrepancy. Actually the *ā* in all these cases is a suffix.

(4) *narāya—nara+ā-ya.* Pāṇinian procedure: *nara+ṅe;* then substitution of *ya* for *ṅe*[2]; then lengthening of the stem-final[3].

(5) *agnī*—No affix is added here. Only the final vowel has been quantitatively changed. This is an instance of vowel-change (not affix) forming a derivative. Pāṇinian process: *agni+au= agnī.*[4] But this is much against the normal rule of *sandhi.*

(6) *devyai—devī+ai.* For *-ai* as a suffix cf. *sev-ai* (*loṭ* 1st per. sing.) etc. Pāṇ procedure: *devī+ṅe;* then an augment *āṭ* after the stem[5].

(7) *nadī* (nom.)—This is the bare stem. Nothing is added here. But the Pāṇinian procedure is: *nadī+su;* then then elision of *-su*[6].

That such forms are without any ending is admitted by all modern scholars. Similar endingless forms are noted also in Greek and Latin. Hence the supposition of a dropped ending, as is done in Pāṇini, is unnecessary. (For further discussion please see the section on Pada in chapter III).

(8) The most tedious process is adopted in the declension of pronouns, especially *asmad* and *yuṣmad.* There neither the stem nor the endings (mostly) are what they are supposed to be[7]. Yet the

---

[1] *āḍ uttamasya picca,* ibid. 3.4.92; (*loṭ-sambandhina uttama-puruṣasya āḍ-āgamo bhavati—Kāśikā*).

[2] *ṅer yaḥ,* Pāṇ. 7.1.13.

[3] *supi ca,* ibid. 7.3.102.

[4] *prathamayoḥ pūrva-savarṇaḥ,* ibid. 6.1.102.

[5] *āṇ nadyāḥ,* ibid. 7.3. 112.

[6] *hal-ṅī-ābbhyo dīrghāt su-ti-si-apṛktaṁ hal,* Pāṇ. 6.1.68.

[7] Actually forms of most pronouns come from a number of stems, not one stem as supposed in Pāṇini. For example, the forms of *idam* really come from *a, aya, ana, ima* and *ida,* not from the one single *idam.* Says Whitney—"The pronouns of the first and second persons are the most irregular and peculiar of all, being made up of fragments coming from various roots and combinations of roots..... The declension of two other demonstratives is so irregularly made up ..... The one is *ayam*.....the other *asau*..... The former of these two pronouns, *ayam* etc. plainly shows itself to be pieced together from a number of defective stems. The majority of forms come from the root *a*....." (Vide Whitney's Grammar, paras 491, 501-502).

It is curious to note that Patañjali also has incidentally admitted this fact, for he calls *ā* and *e* in *ābhyām, ebhiḥ, eṣu* to be *prātipadika*s: *prātipadikāni ekavarṇāni arthavanti—ābhyām, ebhiḥ, eṣu* (Vide Mbhāṣ. II on Vārt. 11, sūtra 5).

forms are sought to be derived from those stems and endings. For example, *aham* is got through the following process :

asmad+su ; then substitution of *aha*[1] for *asm-*(of *asmad*), and *am*[2] for *su* ; this leads to *aha-ad+am*; then joining of *aha-ad* into *ahad*[3] against the normal rule of *sandhi* ; lastly elision of *ṭi* of *ahad*[4].

Thus *asmad>aha-ad>ahad>ah+su>am=aham.* In this way *asmad+su* is made into *aham.*

From the above it will be noted that there are four types of declensional forms—(i) forms with *sup* endings (ii) those with other endings (iii) those without any ending at all and (iv) those with a vowel change only. In Pāṇinian view all forms belong to the first category. And in order to justify this stand the above difficult procedure has had to be adopted for declension.

48. UN-PĀṆINIAN CASE-FORMS

Un-Pāṇinian declensional forms are sometimes met with in literature. Some examples are :

(*a*) accusative—

aho vayaṁ dhanya-tamā
yeṣāṁ nas tādṛśīḥ striyaḥ.

—Bhāg[5].

vi-jahruḥ siñcatīr mithaḥ.

—ibid.[6]

devīr āpaḥ.

—Matsy-P[7].

(*b*) instrumental—

bālānāṁ bharaṇaṁ kena
karomi patinā vinā.

—Devībh[8].

(*c*) ablative-genitive—

sa yayau purāt.

—Bhāg[9].

---

[1] *tvāhau sau*, Pāṇ. 7.2.94.

[2] *ṅe prathamayor am*, ibid. 7.1.28.

[3] *ato guṇe*, ibid. 6.1.97.

[4] *śeṣe lopaḥ*, ibid. 7.2.90.

[5] Bhāg. 10.23.49.

[6] ibid. 9.18.8. (already quoted).

[7] Masty. P. 64. 12.

[8] Devībh. 7.7.30.

[9] Bhāg. 9.18.25.

āśiṣāṁ pateḥ

—ibid[1].

viśanti yena mārgeṇa
vāyasā bahavaḥ puram,
tena mārgeṇa ruddhasya
purasya grahaṇaṁ bhavet.

—Ag-P[2].

(*d*) locative—

naṣṭe mṛte pravrajite
klīve ca patite patau.....

—ibid[3].

pati-vratā ca yā nārī
deśāntara-mṛte patau.....

—PadmaP-[4].

aja-vīthyāṁ dakṣiṇāyāṁ
lokālokasya cottaram.

—Matsy-P[5].

---

[1] ibid. 10.23.45.
[2] Ag-P. 231.1.
[3] ibid. 154. 5.
[4] Padma-P. 1.54.71.
[5] Masty-P. 123. 78.

CONJUGATION

DIFFICULT PROCEDURE

VIKARAṆAS NOT RECOGNISED

UNNECESSARY ADMISSION OF VIKARAṆAS

QUESTIONABLE GAṆA OF SOME ROOTS

UN-PĀṆINIAN VERB-FORMS

49. DIFFICULT PROCEDURE

The Pāṇinian procedure of conjugation is extremely difficult owing to the non-recognition of all the suffixes (endings and *vi-karaṇa*s) involved. Some thirty-eight endings out of over a hundred are mentioned, and a number of *vikaraṇa*s are left out. As a result, immense difficulty is experienced in the process of conjugation, which will be evident from the examples given below.

(i) *bhavet*—Obviously this can be split as *bhu-* + *et* (=*e*, vikaraṇa + *t*, ending). But the long Pāṇinian procedure is:

1st stage—*bhū* + *śap* + *tip*,
2nd stage—*bhū* + *śap* + *t*,[1]
3rd stage—*bhū* + *śap* + *yāsuṭ*[2] + *t*,
4th stage—*bhū* + *śap* + *yā*[3] + *t*,
5th stage—*bhū* + *śap* + *iy*[4] + *t*,
6th stage—*bhū* + *śap* + *i*[5] + *t*,

Explanation—(1) First, *śap* and *tip* are added to the root (*bhū-*); (2) then *tip* is changed to *t* by the elision of *i*; (3) then comes the augment *yāsuṭ* before *t*; (4) then the *s* of *yāsuṭ* is dropped; (5) next *yā* (remnant of *yāsuṭ* after the elision of *s*) is replaced by *iy*; (6) finally *y* of *iy* is elided.

(ii) *bhūyāt*—*bhū-* + *yāt*.

Pāṇinian procedure:

1st stage—*bhū* + *tip*,
2nd stage—*bhū* + *t*[6]
3rd stage—*bhū* + *yāsuṭ*[7] + *t*
4th stage—*bhū* + *yā*[8] + *t*

---

[1] *itaś ca*, Pāṇ. 3.4.100.

[2] *yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣu udātto ṅicca*, ibid. 3.4.103.

[3] *liṅaḥ sa-lopo'nantyasya*, ibid. 7.2.79.

[4] *ato yeyaḥ*, ibid. 7.2.80.

[5] *lopo vyor vali*, ibid. 6.1.66.

[6] *itaś ca*, ibid. 3.4. 100.

[7] *yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣu* etc., ibid. 3.4.103-104.

[8] *skoḥ saṁyogādyor ante ca*, ibid. 8.2.29.

Explanation—First,-*tip* is added to the root; then *tip* is changed to *t*; then *yāsuṭ* is added as augment; then *s* of the augment is elided.

(iii) *abhūt—a + bhū- + t.*

Pāṇinian procedure:

1st stage—*aṭ + bhū + tip,*

2nd stage—*aṭ + bhū + t*[1]

3rd stage—*aṭ + bhū + sic*[2] *+ t*

4th stage—*aṭ + bhū + t*[3]

Explanation—First, *aṭ* and *tip* are added; then *tip* changed to *t*; then *sic* added; finally *sic* dropped.

It is to be noted that though *sic* has nothing to do with the form, yet it is to be added and then elided.

(iv) *edhete—edh- + e + te.*

Pāṇinian procedure:

1st stage—*edh + śap + ātām,*

2nd stage—*edh + śap + iytām,*[4]

3rd stage—*edh + śap + itām*[5]

The thing to be noted here is that though *śap* (=*a*) has no scope here; yet it is admitted as *vikaraṇa.*

(v) *edhetām—edh- + e + tām.*

Pāṇinian procedure:

1st stage—*edh + śap + ātām,*

2nd stage—*edh + śap + iytām*[4]

3rd stage—*edh + śap + itām*[5]

4th stage—*edh + śap + ite*[6]

5th stage—*edh + śap + itām*[7]

A noteworthy point here is that the final stage was once reached in the third stage. Yet the process has continued for two more stages.

---

[1] *itaś ca*, ibid. 3.4.100.

[2] *cleḥ sic*, ibid. 3.1.44.

[3] Elision of -*sic* by *gāti-sthā-ghu-pā-bhūbhyaḥ sicaḥ parasmaipadeṣu*, ibid. 2.4.77.

[4] *āto ṅitaḥ*, ibid. 7.2.81.

[5] *lopo vyor vali*, ibid. 6.1.66.

[6] *ṭita ātmanepadānāṁ ṭere*, ibid. 3.4.79.

[7] *ām etaḥ*, ibid. 3.4.90.

(vi) *edhai—edh- + ai.*

Pāṇinian procedure :

1st stage—*edh + śap + iṭ,*

2nd stage—*edh + śap + e,*[1]

3rd stage—*edh + śap + āṭ*[2] *+ e*

4th stage—*edh + śap + āṭ + ai*[3]

Explanation—First, *śap* and *iṭ* are added ; then *iṭ* is changed to *e* ; then there is the augment *āṭ* ; then finally *e* is changed to *ai.*

(vii) *edheta—edh- + e + ta.* But the Pāṇinian procedure is :

1st stage—*edh + śap + ta*

2nd stage—*edh + śap + sīyuṭ*[4] *+ ta*

3rd stage—*edh + śap + īy*[5] *+ ta*

4th stage—*edh + śap + ī*[6] *+ ta*

Explanation—First, *śap* and *ta* added ; then *sīyuṭ* comes as augment ; then elision of *s* from the augment ; then further elision of *y* from what was left of the augment.

(viii) *edheran—edh- + e + ran.*

Pāṇinian process :

1st stage—*edh + śap + jha*

2nd stage—*edh + śap + ran*[7]

3rd stage—*edh + śap + sīyuṭ*[4] *+ ran*

4th stage—*edh + śap + īy*[5] *+ ran*

5th stage—*edh + śap + ī*[6] *+ ran*

Explanation—*śap, jha ; jha>ran ; sīyuṭ* etc. like the above.

(ix) *edhiṣyete—edh- + i + sye + te.*

Pāṇinian procedure :

1st stage—*edh + ātām*

2nd stage—*edh + sya + ātām*

3rd stage—*edh + iṭ + sya + ātām*

4th stage—*edh + iṭ + sya + āte*[8]

---

[1] *ṭiṭa ātmanepadānām* etc., ibid. 3.4.79.

[2] *āḍ uttamasya picca*, ibid. 3.4.92.

[3] *eta ai*, ibid. 3.4.93.

[4] *liṅaḥ sīyuṭ*, ibid. 3.4.102.

[5] *liṅaḥ sa-lopo'nantyasya*, ibid. 7.2.79.

[6] *lopo vyor vali*, ibid. 6.1.66.

[7] *jhasya ran*, ibid. 3.4.105.

[8] Pāṇ. 3.4.79 (quoted above).

5th stage—*edh* + *iṭ* + *sya*+ *iyte*[1]
6th stage—*edh* + *iṭ* + *sya* + *ite*[2]
*Note—*sye* may be regarded as the dual of *sya*.

(x) *atti—ad-* + *ti*.

Pāṇinian procedure :
1st stage—*ad* + *ti*
2nd stage—*ad* + *śap* + *ti*
3rd stage—*ad*[3] + *ti*

It is to be noted here that *śap* is unnecessarily added only to be elided afterwards.

(xi) *ajani—a* + *jan-* + *i*.

Pāṇinian procedure is :
1st stage—*aṭ* + *jan* + *ta*
2nd stage—*aṭ* + *jan* + *cli* + *ta*
3rd stage—*aṭ* + *jan* + *ciṇ*[4] + *ta*
4th stage—*aṭ* + *jan* + *ciṇ*[5]

It is to be noted that though the ending *ta* is not required here, yet it is added, and then again dropped.

The above examples will give an idea about the cumbrous procedure involved in Pāṇinian conjugation. This cumbrosity results from non-recognition of the right *vikaraṇa*s and endings. The difficulty of the system is such that even advanced students find it almost a baffling task to learn conjugation by means of this, while even teen-agers can do it by the modern method of paradigms within a very short time. For example, it takes very little time to memorise *bhavati, bhavataḥ, bhavanti, bhavasi, bhavathaḥ, bhavatha* etc. from the paradigms given in a modern text book on Sanskrit grammar, and thus have a good knowledge of Sanskrit conjugation. But it takes much time to know through Pāṇinian procedure even a single conjugational form. (Vide the stages behind each form noted above).

The lengthy, intricate Pāṇinian procedure may be tolerated, if grammar is regarded as an independent subject, an end in itself. But that grammar certainly is not. It is not an end, but a means to understand language and literature. This is admitted by Patañjali too who has dwelt upon the pur-

---

[1] ibid. 7.2.81 (quoted).
[2] ibid. 6.1.66 (quoted).
[3] The elision of *śap* is by *adi-prabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ*, Pāṇ. 2.4.72.
[4] *dīpa-jana-buddha* etc., ibid. 3.1.61.
[5] *ciṇo luk*, ibid. 64.104.

poses[1] to which grammar is subservient, and all these purposes are but different ways of expression of one single purpose—understanding of the language. This being the case, grammar should be the shortest cut to the language, not a bewildering maze. 'Grammar is an easy means to understand language,'[2] says Patañjali. But Pāṇinian procedure of conjugation is not an easy way of learning Sanskrit conjugation. The difficult procedure has been necessitated by his unnecessary assumptions—his generalisations in season and out of season. Without such uncalled for generatisations, the conjugation, and the grammar in general, could have been made much simpler.

50. VIKARAṆAS NOT RECOGNISED

A number of *vi-karaṇa*s have not been recognised; and this leads to cumbrosity in conjugation as has already been noted. The following *vi-karaṇa*s are admissible, but not admitted[3]:

(i) *ā*—in *bhavāti, bhavātas* etc. (*leṭ*); *bhavāmi, bhavāni* etc. (*laṭ, loṭ*); *abhavāva* etc. (*laṅ*); *śayāte, śayāvahai* etc.

(ii) *i*—in *svapiti, roditi, śvasiti, aniti, aruditām* etc.; also in *bhaviṣyati* etc.

(iii) *ī*—in *bravīti, arodīt* etc.

(iv) *e*—*sevete, seveta, bhavet* etc.

(v) *ai*—in subjunctive forms like *bhavaite, bhavaithe* (du.) etc.

(vi) *o*—in *karoti, tanoti, akarot* etc.

(vii) *nī*—in *aśnītas, krīṇīte* etc.

It is to be noted that the vikaraṇa *nā* has been admitted in *krī-* class of roots, though *nī* occurs in more cases than *nā*. The ratio of *nī*, *nā* is 5 : 2. The actual figures of their occurrence in the representative root *krī-* are : 45 and 18 (*nī*, *nā*). This being the case how is it that *nā* is recognised as the only *vi-karaṇa*, but not *nī* ?

51. UNNECESSARY ADMISSION OF VIKARAṆAS

Sometimes *vikaraṇa*s are not there, but are admitted. For example—*bhavanti* is said to be=*bhū-*+*śap*+*anti*. But this leads to *sandhi* difficulties. The normal result should have been *bhavānti* (*bhū* > *bho*+*a*+

---

[1] *rakṣā, ūha, laghu, a-sandeha, te'surāḥ, duṣṭaḥ śabdaḥ, yad adhītam* etc. (Vide Mbhāṣ. I)

[2] *na cāntareṇa vyākaraṇaṁ laghūpāyena śabdāḥ śakyā jñātum.* (loc. cit).

[3] *Vikaraṇa*s are about twenty in number according to Dr. Vyas (Vide his *Saṁskṛt kā Bhāṣā-śāstrīya Adhyayana*, p. 191).

anti). But this is avoided by resorting to an unusual *para-rūpa sandhi*.[1] But the difficulty does not arise at all if the *vikaraṇa* is not admitted here : *bhavanti*=*bhū-* (>*bho*)+*anti*. The said rule is made only to justify the *vikaraṇa* in forms having *anti*, *ante* etc. as endings. It has no other application. Hence the rule too is powerless to support the case.

As a rule, it may be said that where the ending begins with *a*, *vikaraṇa* of the value of *a* (such as *śap*) cannot be recognised.

In *seve*, *sevai* *aseve* etc. also the *vikaraṇa śap* is admitted but that is unnecessary. Obviously *seve*=*sev-* +*e* ; *sevai*=*sev-* + *ai* ; *aseve*=*a*+ *sev-* +*e*. The *e* and *ai* are clear endings, and when that is admitted, no other element such as *vikaraṇa* remains between the root and the ending.

52. QUESTIONABLE GAṆA OF SOME ROOTS

There are some roots which are properly to be included in *gaṇas* other than those in which they are placed in Pāṇinian conjugation. (i) A notable example is *paś-* (called *dṛś-* in Pāṇini), which is included in the *bhvādi-gaṇa*, but properly it should go to the *divādi-gaṇa*, for the *vikaraṇa* is *ya* ; cf.

div-ya-ti
paś-ya-ti

The Pāṇinian analysis of *paśyati* is -*paśya* (for *dṛś-*)+*śap*+*ti*. Against this it may be said that if *paśya* can be a radical substitution, so is *divya* in *divyati* etc., so that *divyati*=*divya* (for *div-*)+*śap*+*ti*. Thus the *divādi gaṇa* itself will have no scope at all. But since that *gaṇa* has been admitted, *paśyati* (like *divyati*) should go to that *gaṇa*, because of the *ya*-element there.

The root *paś-* has not been recognised in Pāṇini, but this is obvious in *paśyati*, *paśyatas* etc. Besides, there are cognates forms in other Indo-European languages which too go to prove its (*paś-*) existence ; cf. L. *spec-ere*, Gk. *skeptomai* (for *spek-tomai*),[2] G. *spahen*, Eng. *spy* ; also Skt. *spaṣṭa*, *paspaśā*, *spaśa*, *paspaśe* (pft.), *aspaṣṭa* (aor.), *paspaśāna* (part.) These forms are from a root *spaś-*, and *paś-* (in *paśyati* etc.) is nothing but a variant of the same root.[3]

(ii) The roots *sthā-*, *pā-*, *ghrā-* are listed in the *bhvādi* class, but their forms (*tiṣṭhāmi*, *jighrāmi* etc.) clearly show that they belong to the reduplicating class (*juhotyādi*). Says Whitney—

---

[1] *ato guṇe*, Pāṇ. 6.1.97.

[2] Vide CD.

[3] Also vide SED on *paś-*, which is said to be "originally identical with *spaś-*."

'A number of roots have been transferred from this (=redup. class) to the *a-* or *bhū-* class, their reduplicated root becoming a stereotyped stem inflected after the manner of *a-* stems'.[1]

(iii) In the *bhū-* class are also listed the roots in *gāyati, trāyate, dhyāyati* etc.[2] But actually these should go to the *ya-* class.[3] For the vikaraṇa *ya* in them is obvious : *gā-ya-ti trā-ya-te* etc. It cannot be said that the *y* is radical. For the *y* is not found outside the present system ; cf. *gā-sya-ti, a-gā-sīt, trā-sya-te, a-trā-sta, trā-sīṣṭa* etc. This shows that the *y* belongs to the *vi-karaṇa.*

(iv) The roots *cakās-, jakṣ-, jāgṛ-, daridrā-, vevī-, dīdhi* are included in the root-class (*adādi-gaṇa*). But their reduplicate character is more or less obvious, and hence they should properly be reckoned with the reduplicating class (*juhotyādi*).[4]

(v) The roots *rud-, śvas-, svap-* and *an-* are listed in the root-class. But these roots take a *vikaraṇa* (*i*) which is against the root-class. Hence these had better be excluded from this *gaṇa* and placed in a separate *gaṇa* (other than the existing ones.)

(vi) The roots *mṛ-, dhṛ-* and *ā-dṛ-* are reckoned as belonging to the *ya-* class (*divādi-gaṇa*). and á-class (*tudādi*). But their forms show that the conjugation is passive.[5] For the accent is on *ya*, and *ṛ* has been changed to *ri* (*mri-yá-te, dhri-yá-te, ā-dri-yá-te*) as in the passive conjugation. Hence they need not be regarded as regular cases of the said *gaṇas.* They may belong to these *gaṇas*, but their present forms are passive, which for some reason or other have come to be used as active. Their active transitive forms must have once existed ; cf. *mar-aka* (epidemic, lit. killer) ,*dharaṇī* (earth, lit. holder), *vasundharā* (earth, lit. holder of treasure). Also notable is the root *jan-* which is now intransitive and listed in the *divādi* class, but

---

[1] Whitney's *Sans. Gram.*, para 670.

[2] The roots *kṣā-* (burn), *gā-* (sing)., *glā-* (be weary), *trā-* (save), *dhyā-* (meditate), *pyā-* (fill), *mlā-* (relax), *śyā-*(coagulate), *styā-*(stiffen), *rā-* (bark), *vā-*(be blown).

[3] '.....there seems to be no good reason why they should not rather be regarded as *ā-* roots of the *ya-* class.'—Whitney (para 761 e).

[4] Vide Whitney's Grammar, paras 640-641, 676 : "Certain obviously reduplicated verbs are treated by the native grammarians as if simple, and referred to this conjugation (root-class). Such are the intensively reduplicated *jāgṛ-, daridrā-, vevī-, dīdhī-* and *cakās-*." (para 641).

[5] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 773.

was transitive (meaning 'beget', 'generate') and of the *bhvādi* class in the Veda ; cf. *yaḥ sūryaṁ ya uṣasaṁ jajāna.*[1]

53. UN-PĀṆINIAN VERB-FORMS

Un-Pāṇinian verb-forms are not rare in literature. Some cases may be noted here.

as- (to be) :

kutra kṣattur bhagavatā
Maitreyeṇāsa saṅgamaḥ. —Bhāg.[2]

Here *āsa* is used for *liṭ* of *as-*, which is noramlly expected. But the Pāṇinian form is *babhūva.*[3]

ās- :

upāsante mahātmānaḥ
sarve mām eva su-vrate. —Matsy-P.[4]

Here *upāsante* is used for Pāṇinian *upāsate.*

iṣ- (with *anu*) :

mṛtyum anveṣase dhruvam. —R.[5]

na ratnam anviṣyati
mṛgyate hi tat. —Śak.[6]

is- is included in class I (*bhvādi*), and the substitution of *ch* for *ṣ* is enjoined.[7] The above forms have no such substitution, and *anviṣyati* is clearly a *divādi* conjugation.

grah- :

'*gṛhṇa phalguṁ surottama*'.

Also cf. Ag-P.[8]

ghrā:- :

na śṛṇoti na cāghrāti
na paśyati na tāmyati. —ibid.[9]

---

[1] RV. 2.12.7.
[2] Bhāg. 3.1.3 ; also 10.3.42.
[3] By *aster bhūḥ*, Pāṇ. 2.4.52.
[4] Matsy-P. 179. 66.
[5] R. 3.3.9.
[6] Śak. 3.16.
[7] *iṣu-gami-yamāṁ chaḥ*, Pāṇ. 7.3.77.
[8] Ag- P. 135.1.
[9] ibid. 376.3.

Here *ā-ghrāti* is used for *ā-jighrati*.

vid- :

iti ha vāva na vidāmaḥ.

—Bhāg.[1]

Here *vidāmaḥ* for *vidmaḥ*.

han- :

gāṁ yaḥ padā'hanat.

—ibid.[2]

Here the prescribed form is *ahan*.

---

[1] Bhāg. 6.10.35.

[2] ibid. 1.16.5.

ATMANEPADA–PARASMAIPADA

VIOLATIONS OF RULES BY ANCIENT AUTHORS

WHAT DO THE VIOLATIONS INDICATE : UNDUE RESTRICTIONS

THE EVIDENCE OF GREEK

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

54. VIOLATIONS OF RULES BY ANCIENT AUTHORS

Pāṇinian rules regarding the use of *Ātmanepada* and *Parasmaipada* are often violated by ancient authors. Some examples are :

(1) *ay-* (Ā)[1] :

anenaiva tu mānena
udayanti dine dine. —Ag. P.[2]

(2) *arc-* (P) :

arcayeta sadā caiva. —MBh.[3]

(3) *arth-* (Ā) :

yāṁ-yāṁ Brahmarṣayaḥ siddhāḥ
prārthayanti parāṁ gatim —ibid.[4]

(4) *āp-* (P) :

adharmaṁ prāpsyase vipra —ibid.[5]

(5) *ās-* (Ā) :

(i) *yam upāsanti tattvajñāḥ* —ibid.[6]

(ii) *upāsanti mahātmānaṁ*
sarve divya-pari-cchadāḥ. —Matsy-P.[7]

(iii) .....*prasarpata kim āsatha.* —ibid.[8]

(6) *iṣ-* (P) :

(i) *śrotum icchāmahe punaḥ* —ibid.[9]

(ii) *te'nveṣamāṇā dayitaṁ Kṛṣṇam* —Bhāg.[10]

---

[1] Ā and P stand for *Ātmanepada* and *Parasmaipada* respectively.
[2] Ag- P. 123.5.
[3] MBh., Anu. 81.34.
[4] ibid. Anu. 63.39.
[5] ibid. Anu. 20.15.
[6] ibid. Anu. 14.198.
[7] Masty- P. 160.82.
[8] ibid. 135.47.
[9] ibid. 1.7.
[10] Bhāg. 10.16.17.

(7) *īkṣ-* (Ā) :

(i) *udaṅ-mukhaḥ kuṇḍam īkṣet.* —Ag-P.[1]

(ii) *āste pratīkṣaṁs tajjanma* —Bhāg.[2]

(iii) *avaikṣat Sañjayaṁ tatra*
rudamāno mahī-patiḥ. —MBh.[3]

(8) *īś-* (Ā) :

kṛtānta-pāśānna
vi-moktum īśet. —Bhāg.[4]

(9) *kath-* (P) :

sarva-siddhi-karaṁ jñānaṁ
kathayasva mama prabho. —Śivas.[5]

(10) *kamp-*(Ā) :

cakampus Tripure nāryaḥ. —Matsy-P.[6]

(11) *kup-* (P) :

kupyeta no dhruvaṁ Rudraḥ —ibid.[7]

nāpsu snāyān na kupyeta. —Bhāg.[8]

(12) *kūj-* (P) :

nirayeṣviva nir-magnāḥ
kūjante pramathāsurāḥ —Matsy-P.[9]

(13) *krand-* (P) :

hā tāteti krandamānāḥ
svakaṁ nindanti karma te. —Ag-P.[10]

(14) *kram-*, to attack (P) :

vāmaṁ dakṣiṇa-pādena
pādam ā-kramate. —ibid.[11]

---

[1] Ag- P. 75.2.
[2] Bhāg. 10.2.23.
[3] MBh., Śalya. 1.55.
[4] Bhāg. 5.5.27.
[5] Śivas. 2.
[6] Matsy- P. 139.66.
[7] ibid. 130.35.
[8] Bhāg. 6.18.43.
[9] Matsy- P. 135.17.
[10] Ag- P. 371.29 ; also Bhāg. 10.16.11.
[11] ibid. 232.34.

(15) *krīḍ-* (P) :

saha-Rāmo Vraja-strīṇāṁ
cikrīḍe janayan mudam. —Bhag.[1]

(16) *gam-* (P) :

jijñāsārthaṁ Pāṇḍavānāṁ
gacchasva tvaṁ Gajāhvayam. —ibid.[2]

(17) *gai-* (P) :

gāthāmetām a-gāyata. —Bhāg.[3]

(18) *car-* (P) :

paretācaritāṁ bhīmāṁ
ravir ā-carate diśam. —R.[4]

(19) *cint-* (P) :

tataḥ śubhāni karmāṇi
cintayānaḥ. —Matsy-P.[5]

(20) *ceṣṭ-*(Ā) :

buddhiś ca na vi-ceṣṭati. —Kaṭh-Up.[6]
ud-veṣṭanti vi-ceṣṭanti. —MBh.[7]

(21) *ji-* (P) :

ya enāṁ jayate kṛtsnāṁ
sam-rāḍ iti sa kīrtitaḥ. —Matsy-P.[8]

(22) jīv- (P) :

(i) *ṛtānṛtābhyāṁ jīveta.* —Mn.[9]
(ii) *kaccin mārjāro jīvase ?* —MBh.[10]

---

[1] Bhāg. 10.8.27.
[2] ibid. 10.48.32 ; also Matsy- P. 123. 37 ; 152.2.
[3] Bhāg. 9.19.1.
[4] R. 2.63.15 ; also MBh.. Śalya. 11.33.
[5] Matsy- P. 104.12 ; also 184.37 ; Bhāg. 10.2.24.
[6] Kaṭh- Up. 2.3.10.
[7] MBh., Śalya. 8.17.
[8] Matsy- P. 113.15.
[9] Mn. 4.4 ; also Ag- P. 152.5.
[10] MBh., Śānti. 128.49.

(23) *jñā-* (with *prati*) (Ā) :

Kaunteya prati-jānīhi
na me bhaktaḥ pra-ṇaśyati. —G.[1]

(24) *tap-* (P) :

madhyāhne tapate raviḥ. —Matsy-P.[2]

(25) *tij-* (with *-san*) (Ā) :

titikṣato dur-vi-ṣahaṁ tavāgaḥ. —Bhāg.[3]

(26) *tyaj-* (P) :

prāk-tanaṁ tyajate vapuḥ. —ibid.[4]

(27) *dah-* (P) :

(i) *tad ahaṁ Tripuraṁ dhakṣye.* —Matsy-P.[5]
(ii) *na ca dahyanti gacchantyaḥ*
su-taptair api pāṁśubhiḥ. —MBh.[6]

(28) *dṛś-* (P) :

(i) *tatra vai drakṣyase striyam.* —ibid.[7]
(ii) *dadṛśe ca tathā tatra*
nānā-rūpān patatriṇaḥ. —ibid.[8]
(iii) *sa gacchann eva dadṛśe*
Himavantaṁ mahā-girim. —ibid.[9]

(29) *namasya-* (P) :

namasye puruṣaṁ tvā'dyam. —Bhāg.[10]

(30) *nard-* (P) :

vi-nardamāno Madreśaḥ —MBh.[11]

---

[1] G. 9.31 ; but again *Ātmanepada* appears in 18.65. (*pratijāne*).
[2] Matsy- P. 123.34.
[3] Bhāg. 3.1.11.
[4] ibid. 10.1.39.
[5] Matsy- P. 132.14.
[6] MBh., Anu. 19.88.
[7] ibid., Anu. 19.23.
[8] ibid., Anu. 117.48.
[9] ibid., Anu. 116.1.
[10] Bhāg. 1.8.18.
[11] MBh., Śalya. 10.25.

(31) *nṛt-* (P) :

hasate jayate caiva
nṛtyate ca manoharam. —ibid.[1]

(32) *paṭh-* (P) :

ya imaṁ Rudra-vijayaṁ
paṭhate vi-jayāvaham. —Matsy-P.[2]

(33) *pat-* (P) :

(i) *patitenāmbhasā cchannaḥ*
patamānena cāsakṛt. —R.[3]

(ii) *yatra Bhāgīrathī Gaṅgā*
patate diśam uttarām. —MBh.[4]

(34) *pā-* (P) :

gavādi pivate yasmāt. —Ag-P.[5]

(35) *pracch-* (P) :

(i) *Dhṛtarāṣṭraṁ kathaṁ pṛcche*
yasya putra-śataṁ hatam. —Matsy-P.[6]

(ii) *athāpi pṛcche tvāṁ vīra.* —Bhāg.[7]

(36) *bhakṣ-* (P) :

sarva-māṁsāni na bhakṣayīta. —MBh.[8]

(37) *bhī-* (P) :

(i) *śuṣmāc cid asya*
parvatā bhayante. —RV.[9]

(ii) *bhayante viśvā bhuvanā marudbhyaḥ.*
—ibid.[10]

---

[1] ibid., Anu. 14. 156-157.
[2] Matsy- P. 139.85.
[3] R. 2.63.18.
[4] MBh. ,Anu. 25.15 ; also Bhāg. 10.6.14 ; Matsy- P. 133.11.
[5] Ag- P. 64.44 ; also Matsy- P. 135.16.
[6] Matsy- P. 102.10.
[7] Bhāg. 3.21.56.
[8] MBh., Anu. 73.11.
[9] RV. 2.12.13.
[10] ibid. 1.85.8.

(38) *bhuj-* (eat) (Ā) :

(i) *śigbhis tvagbhir dṛṣadbhiś ca bubhujuḥ kṛta-bhājanāḥ.* —Bhāg.[1]

(ii) *muktvā śikyāni bubhujuḥ samaṁ Bhagavatā mudā.* —ibid.[2]

(39) *bhū-* (P) :

(i) *tasmāt pra-bhavate puṇyā Sarayūr loka-pāvanī.* —Matsy-P.[3]

(ii) *tasmāt pra-bhavate puṇyo Lauhityaś ca nado mahān.* —ibid.[4]

(40) *bhram-* (P) :

(i) *ete nāḍīṣu sarvāsu bhramante jīva-rūpiṇah.* —Śivas.[5]

(ii) *madhyena Puṣkarasyātha bhramate dakṣiṇāyane.* —Matsy-P. [6]

(41) *yā-* (P) :

cintayantau kṛta-snehau yāsyethe mad-gatiṁ parām. —Bhāg.[7]

(42) *yāc-* (Ā) :

svayaṁ dehīti yācati. —MBh.[8]

(43) *yudh-* (Ā) :

(i) *ahanyahani yudhyantam* —ibid.[9]

(ii) *yudhyāmo Nandinaṁ pīḍya.* —Matsy-P.[10]

(44) *rabh-* (with *ā*) (Ā) :

ārabhecchubha-saptamīm. —Matsy-P.[11]

---

[1] Bhāg. 10.13.9.
[2] ibid. 10.13.7.
[3] Matsy- P. 120.17.
[4] ibid. 120.12.
[5] Śivas. 47.
[6] Matsy- P. 123.43 ; also 124.49.
[7] Bhāg. 10.3.45 ; also Matsy- P. 133.23.
[8] MBh., Anu., 63.21.
[9] ibid., Śalya. 6.34.
[10] Matsy- P. 135.19.
[11] ibid. 79.2 ; also 80.3 ; 92.26 ; etc.

(45) *ram-* (Ā) :

hāsaś ca vara-nārīṇāṁ
citta-vyākula-kārakaḥ,
Tripure dānavendrāṇāṁ
ramatāṁ śrūyate sadā. —ibid.[1]

(46) *ram-* (with *vi*) (P) :

uttiṣṭha bhadre bhadraṁ te
svayaṁ vai vi-ramasva ca. —MBh.[2]

(47) *rud-* (P) :

rudate rodayatyapi. —ibid.[3]

(48) *labh-* (Ā) :

(i) *Aśva-medha-phalaṁ labhet* —Matsy-P.[4]
(ii) *sarvārthāṁś ca labhen naraḥ.* —ibid.[5]

(49) *vad-* (P) :

tān apīha vadasva naḥ. —ibid.[6]

(50) *vad-* (with *-ṇic*) (Ā) :

kecid veṇūn vādayantaḥ. —Bhāg.[7]

(51) *vam-* (P) :

vamante rudhiraṁ vaktraiḥ. —Matsy-P.[8]

(52) *vas-* (P) :

(i) *narake vasate ghore*
gavāṁ kroṣṭā hi dāruṇe. —ibid.[9]
(ii) *vāṇijye vasate Lakṣmīḥ.* —Cāṇ.

(53) *vah-* (with *pra*) (P) :

tasmāt pra-vahate divyā
nadī Mandākinī śubhā. —Matsy-P.[10]

---

[1] ibid. 130.15.
[2] MBh., Anu. 20.12.
[3] ibid., Anu. 14.156-157 ; also Śalya. 1. 55-56.
[4] Matsy- P. 105.29 ; also 105.31.
[5] ibid. 78.14.
[6] ibid. 270.2 ; also 179.46 ; Ag- P. 117.1 ; Bhāg. 10.1.7
[7] Bhāg. 10.12.7.
[8] Matsy- P. 135.42.
[9] ibid. 105.5.
[10] ibid. 120.4 ; also 120.7.

(54) *vah-*, passive (Ā) :

ahaṁ tvañ ca tathāpyanye
bhūtair uhyāmaḥ pārthiva. —Ag-P.[1]

(55) *viś-* (P) :

(i) *tvāṁ jarā viśatāṁ manda*
vi-rūpa-karaṇī nṛṇām. —Bhāg.[2]

(ii) *Agnim ā-viśate rātrau.* —Matsy-P.[3]

(56) *vṛt-* (Ā) :

tamaḥ pra-viṣṭam ā-lakṣya
tato ni-vavṛtuḥ striyaḥ. —Bhāg.[4]

(57) *vraj-* (P) :

sthita-dhīḥ kiṁ pra-bhāṣeta
kim āsīta vrajeta kim. —G.[5]

(58) *śaṁs-* (P) :

tathā pra-śaṁsate dīpān. —MBh.[6]

(59) *śudh-* (P) :

daśāhāc chudhyate vipraḥ. —AG-P.[7]

(60) *śru-* (P) :

na śroṣye paruṣā giraḥ. —MBh.[8]

(61) *śru-* (with *-san*) (Ā) :

śuśrūṣantaḥ pitṛn putrāḥ —Matsy-P.[9]

(62) *sañj-*, passive (Ā) :

na bhadre para-dāreṣu
mano me sam-pra-sajyati. —MBh.[10]

---

[1] Ag- P. Chap. 380.
[2] Bhāg. 9.18.36.
[3] Matsy- P. 127.10.
[4] Bhāg. 10.30.43.
[5] G. 2.54.
[6] MBh., Anu. 63.27.
[7] Ag- P. 158.13.
[8] MBh., Śalya. 2.48.
[9] Matsy- P. 130.12.
[10] MBh., Anu. 20.12.

(63) *sah-* (Ā) :

pramathānāṁ mahā-vegaṁ
sahāmaḥ śvasanopamam. —Matsy-P.[1]

(64) *sṛj-* (P) :

vāpīm amṛta-toyena pūrṇāṁ srakṣye. —ibid.[2]

(65) *sev-* (Ā) :

sadā sevanti tat tīrtham. —ibid.[3]

(66) *sthā-* (P) :

(i) *tiṣṭhāmahe' thāpi*
kathañcid ājau. —Bhāg.[4]

(ii) *rāja-dvāre hyatiṣṭhata.* —Matsy-P.[5]

(iii) *a-tiṣṭhata raṇe vīraḥ.* —MBh.[6]

(67) *sthā-* (with *ava*) (Ā) :

Gaṇā yatrāvatiṣṭhanti —Matsy-P.[7]

(68) *sthā-* (with *vi*) (Ā) :

vyatiṣṭhad eka-pādena. —MBh[8].

(69) *smṛ-* (P) :

yāvan na smarate janma. —Matsy-P.[9]

(70) *has-* (P) :

hasate jayate caiva
nṛtyate ca manoharam. —MBh.[10]

These are only a few examples. More are easily quotable from the great Purāṇic literature showing the use of Un-Pāṇinian Padas with almost every root.

---

[1] Matsy- P. 136.19 ; also Bhāg. 10.22.32.

[2] ibid. 135.10.

[3] ibid. 105.14 ; also 107.30 ; Bhāg. 9.19.18.

[4] Bhāg. 3.18.11 ; also Matsy- P. 133.28.

[5] Matsy- P. 102.14.

[6] MBh., Śalya. 9.26.

[7] Masty- P. 182.63.

[8] MBh., Anu. 83.29.

[9] Matsy- P. 104.6 ; also 104.7.

[10] MBh. , Anu. 14.156-157.

55. WHAT DO THE VIOLATIONS INDICATE : UNDUE RESTRICTIONS

The above examples show that eminent authors of the past used *Ātmanepada* and *Parasmaipada* in a way that runs counter to Pāṇini's rules. In Pāṇini every root has been assigned a Pada (*Parasmai-* or *Ātmane-*), and their use in a different Pada, unless specially provided, is a taboo. But it is clear that these authors employed the Padas optionally, that is to say, any Pada with any root. This is a great difference.

From this it may not be incorrect to say that the rules and regulations with regard to the use of these Padas in Pāṇini are not in consonance with the ancient tradition. What were freely usable have been subjected to restrictions.

It may be argued that the violations in the cited passages are for the sake of metre only.[1] But the following examples will repudiate this view :

(i) (*a*) *jijñāsārthaṁ Pāṇḍavānāṁ gacchasva tvaṁ gajāhvayam.* —Bhāg.[2]

(*b*) *gacchasva sukṛtam kṛtvā.* —MBh.[3]

(ii) *yatra Bhāgīrathī Gaṅgā patate diśam uttarām* —ibid.[4]

(iii) *tato nīla-vanoddeśaṁ drakṣyase megha-sannibham.* —MBh.[5]

(iv) *na mukta-keśā tiṣṭheta* —Matsy-P.[6]

(v) *kena vā kāraṇenaiva tiṣṭhante loka-sat-tamāḥ.* —ibid.[7]

(vi) *grahān ni-vṛtya sūryāt tu carate ṛkṣa-maṇḍalam.* —ibid.[8]

(vii) *anenaiva tu mānena udayanti dine dine.* —Ag-P.[9]

---

1 Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 529a ; also *Sanskrit Syntax* by Dr. J. S. Speijer, p. 237.

2 Bhāg. 10.48.32.

3 MBh., Anu. 21.10.

4 ibid., Anu. 25.15.

5 ibid., Anu. 19.23.

6 Matsy- P. 7.42.

7 ibid. 110.6.

8 ibid. 124.36.

9 Ag- P. 123.5.

It will be seen that the violations of the Pada rules was not necessitated by metre in the above examples. Even if the Padas allowed in Pāṇini were used, the metre would not suffer. For example, instead of *carate* (exam. vi), *udayanti* (ex. vii) etc. the prescribed forms *carati, udayante* etc. could be used without injury to the metre.

This shows that metre is not the cause of the violations. The cause must be something else.

A further contention may be that violations of grammatical rules often occur in poetry. This is a poetic license.

To this there are two answers : (i) In later Sanskrit poetry, this does not happen. There the grammatical rules have been meticulously followed. If the later poets could observe the rules, why not the earlier poets ? Therefore the violations are not due to poetic license. (ii) In prose writings too such violations occur ; e.g.,

(i) *vi-sṛjate, vi-sṛjeta* —ŚBr.[1]

(ii) *sa mano'sṛjata,*
tad vācam asṛjata. —MS.[2]

(iii) *devāḥ pāpmānaṁ nāpajaghnire.* —Ait-Br.[3]

There are other examples too.

Another explanation of these violations is that the Epics and Purāṇas were written for the common people, not for the cultivated audience.[4] To this it may be replied that (i) literature for the common people has been produced (e.g., *Pañcat.*, *Hit.* etc.) without infringement of grammatical rules. Why should the grand masters of the past (Vyāsa, Vālmīki etc.) commit such errors ? (ii) The use of incorrect Sanskrit has all along been denounced. Should it be supposed that the great ancient authors paid no heed to it ? (iii) *Parasmaipada* in lieu of *Ātmanepada*, and vice versa, cannot make the language any the easier. (iv) Simplicity of language does not necessarily mean incorrect uses. (v) Supposing the violations of *Ātmane-* and *Parasmaipada* rules made the language easier to the common people, why is it that the prescribed Padas also are used at times ? Both Padas are used with a root frequently ; e.g. ;

(i) *saha-cakro bhramatyakṣaḥ ;* but again—

---

[1] ŚBr. 1.1.1.6.

[2] MS. 4.2.3.

[3] Ait- Br. 6.1.1.

[4] *Sans. Lang.* pp. 51-52.

akṣaḥ sahaiva cakreṇa
bhramate'sau dhruveritaḥ. —Matsy-P.[1]

(ii) *ahaṁ vanam idaṁ dur-gaṁ*
Virādho nāma rākṣasaḥ,
carāmi..... —R.[2]

Again— *paretācaritāṁ bhīmāṁ*
ravir ā-carate diśam. —ibid.[3]

If *bhramate* and *carate* in these passages were intended for quick understanding of the uncultivated audience, then why were their *Parasmaipada* counterparts, again, used ? This becomes inconsistent. About all the so-called irregularities of the Epic Sanskrit, the same may be said. That is to say, they cannot be meant for simplification of the language for the common people. For then, why are the regular forms also used ?

Thus it is clear that the violations cannot be explained away. They require a deeper consideration. It seems the violations are not violations ; rather the rules are a deviation from the traditional course. For the cases are too numerous to be called violations of rules.

56. THE EVIDENCE OF GREEK

The evidence of the Greek language is helpful here. The Greek verb has three voices—active, middle and passive. These correspond to Sanskrit *Parasmaipada, Ātmanepada* and the passive voice respectively. Now, all Greek verbs, with a few exceptions, are conjugated in all the three voices. From this it may not be incorrect to say that Sanskrit also had the same freedom of conjugation. And actually this is found in the ancient language, as noted above.

Now, let it be considered. Greek and Epic Sanskrit have agreed in conjugating the verbs in any Pada or voice. As the Greek verb may be conjugated either in the active or in the middle voice, according to sense, so are the Epic verbs conjugated both in *Ātmanepada* and in *Parasmaipada*. This agreement between Greek and Epic Sanskrit doubtless leads to the conclusion that this freedom of conjugation was the original state of things, and this being agreed upon, Pāṇinian rules, restraining this freedom of conjugation, come to be an innovation, without the sanction of ancient tradition, whether of Sanskrit or of Indo-European.

---

[1] Matsy- P. 124. 48-49.

[2] R. 3.2.12.

[3] ibid. 2. 63.15.

57. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The consideration of a few more points is also necessary here :

(i) The names *Parasmaipada* and *Ātmanepada* are not meaningless like *ghi*, *ghu*, *ṭi* etc. They have their meanings, and therefore are to be used wherever their senses permit them. According to some[1] *Parasmaipada* means a verb where the action passes to *para* or another (i.e., the object); hence a transitive verb. And *Ātmanepada* means a verb where the action is restricted to *ātman* (=oneself i.e., the doer); hence a reflexive verb. In another view[2] *Parasmaipada* is a verb where the fruit of action accrues to *para* or a person other than the agent ; and *Ātmanepada* a verb where the fruit is *ātmane* i.e., accrues to the agent or doer. Of these the second view seems more satisfying seeing that the fourth case-ending in *parasmai* and *ātmane* then becomes appropriate (*parasmai* = for another ; *ātmane*=for self).[3] Besides, this has an indirect support from Pāṇini himself who has also enjoined the use of *Ātmanepada* with regard to a number of roots in case the fruit of the action goes to the doer.[4]

Now, in the over-all distribution of *Parasmai-* and *Atmane-padas* in Pāṇini this fundamental difference between these *padas* has been lost sight of. With Pāṇini the question is which root is to have which *pada* (*parasmai-* or *ātmane-*), whereas the question should actually be : which *pada* is to be used in which sense. The names (*Parasmai*, and *Ātmane padas*) lose their meanings, if each is restricted to a particular group of roots as is done in Pāṇini ; but they are justified when the *padas* are employed according to their inherent sense[5] regardless of the root.

(ii) That some roots have been treated as *Ubhaya-padī* is not due to any special merit in the roots themselves. This shows that other roots also can claim the same position or privilege ; but that

---

[1] Vide Whitney—*Sanskrit Grammar*, para 529 ; Monier Williams—*A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*, para 243.

[2] Vide T. Burrow—*Sanskrit Language*, p. 293 ; Keilhorn—*Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*, p. 78.

[3] The *caturthī* is *tādarthye* (Vide Kāś. on Pāṇ. 6.3.7).

[4] *svarita-ñitaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* etc., Pāṇ. 1.3. 72-76.

[5] i.e., *Parasmaipada*, if the fruit of action goes to another ; *Ātmanepada*, if it goes to the doer.

has been denied them in Pāṇini. This privilege, however, is enjoyed by all the roots in the ancient language (of Epic etc.).

(iii) Some roots are conjugated partly in one Pada and partly in another (e.g., *mṛ-*, *vṛt-*). This is an indication that they were originally used in both Padas.

(iv) No root is by nature *Parasmaipadī* or *Ātmanepadī*. There is nothing in a root to deserve this classification. Had there been any, it would be possible to tell the Pada of a given root without further training. But this is impossible. In order to say it, the only way is to consult the classification itself as it is laid down in grammar. Thus it is clear that the classification placing some roots in *Paramaipada* and some in *Ātmanepada* is undeserved, all roots being capable of both Padas.

58. CONCLUSION

From the violations of rules by Epic and Vedic writers, from the evidence of Greek where all (with few exceptions[1]) verbs are conjugated in both Padas (active and middle), and in view of the above considerations (Sec. 57), it may be concluded that the rules laid down for *Parasmai-* and *Ātmanepadas* in Pāṇini[2] require reconsideration or revision. To be exact, such rules are not required at all. All roots are to have both the Padas, as is seen in the Epic language, and the Padas are to be used only according to the exigency of the sense.

---

[1] These exceptions are doubtless unoriginal.

[2] i.e., in the body of the Aṣṭādhyāyī (1.3.12-93) as well as in the Dhātupāṭha.

USE OF TENSES AND MOODS

LUṬ AS A *LAKĀRA* INADMISSIBLE

USES NOT NOTED IN PĀṆINI

MISCELLANEOUS

59. *LUṬ* AS A *LAKĀRA* INADMISSIBLE

Luṭ as a *lakāra* (tense) is unacceptable. For its forms do not differ from those with the *kṛt* suffix *-tṛ*. The forms of *luṭ* 3rd person are the same as the nom. sing. du. and plur. forms of a *-tṛ*-derivative. For example, *gam-*, *luṭ* 3rd per. sing. du. and plur., and *gam-* + *-tṛ* (= *gantṛ*), nom. sing. du. and plur. forms are the same—*gantā, gantārau, gantāraḥ.*

The forms of the remaining persons of *luṭ* are dissolvable into a *tṛ*-form and a form of the verb *as-*, to be.[1]

The middle forms (*kartāse* etc.) may not be readily so dissolvable, for middle forms of *as-* are not available. Yet there can be little doubt that the formation (of the middle) is just the same (*-tṛ*-derivative + a form of *as-*) though middle forms of *as-* may not be otherwise available.

About the formation of *luṭ* Whitney says[2]—

> "It consists in a derivative *nomen agentis* having the value of a future active participle, and used either with or without an accompanying auxiliary.....The noun is formed by the suffix *-tṛ*..... In the third person the nom. masc. of the noun in the three numbers respectively is used without auxiliary.....In the other persons, the first and second persons present of *as-*, be, are used as auxiliary."

The root *as-* and the suff. *-tṛ* in the formation of *luṭ* are conclusively proved by the following examples from the Epics : *vaktāsti* (he will speak) (=*vaktā* + *asti*) ; *asmi gantā*, where *asmi* precedes and is clear ; *prati grahītā tām asmi*, where *asmi* is separated from the agent noun by an intervening word (*tām*) ; *hantā tvam asi*, where *asi* is separated and clear ; *kartārau svaḥ*,[3] where the *nomen agentis* in *-tṛ* has been regularly declined ; *draṣṭrī*

---

[1] Thus—

gantāsi	=	*gantā*	+	*asi*
gantāsthaḥ	=	*gantā*	+	*sthaḥ*
gantāstha	=	*gantā*	+	*stha*
gantāsmi	=	*gantā*	+	*asmi*
gantāsvaḥ	=	*gantā*	+	*svaḥ*
gantāsmaḥ	=	*gantā*	+	*smaḥ*

[2] Whitney's *Sans. Gram.* paras 942-944.

[3] For Pāṇinian *kartāsvaḥ.*

asmi,[1] where the fem. form of the noun has been used ; *yoddhā syām*, where an optative form of *as-* has been used.[2]

These examples leave not the least doubt as to the composition of the *luṭ- lakāra*. Whereas in the above examples an agent noun in *-tṛ* (in any gender) and a form of the verb *as-* could be freely combined, in the so-called *luṭ- lakāra* the masculine form of the agent noun and a present indicative form of *as-* are used in a fixed order.

That the so-called *luṭ*-forms are not verbs proper, but a combination of noun and verb, is proved also by their accent. "Unlike all true verbal forms, the combination retains its accent everywhere even in an independent clause;"[3] e.g., *trahi vā atināstro bhavitāsmi*. (ŚB.).

In view of all these, *luṭ* cannot be admitted as a separate verbal tense.

60. USES NOT NOTED IN PĀṆINI

(i) *āśīr-liṅ* without benediction

This *lakāra*, though meant for *āśis* or benediction, is sometimes used without it just like a mere *vidhi-liṅ* ; e.g.,

naṣṭe mṛte pravrajite
klīve ca patite patau,
pañcasvāpatsu nārīṇāṁ
patir anyo vidhīyate ;
mṛte tu devare deyāt
tad-abhāve yathecchayā. —Ag-P.[4]

Here *deyāt* is used for *dadyāt*.

(ii) *vidi-liṅ* as conditional or subjunctive of the past.

Lṛṅ has been enjoined in this sense (*kriyātipatti* in the past).[5] But *vidhi-liṅ* also is often met with[6] ; e.g.,

ṛṣer hi Śṛṅger vacanaṁ
kṛtvā daṣṭvā ca pārthivam,
yadi gacched asau pāpo
nanu jīvet pitā mama.

---

[1] For Pāṇinian *draṣṭāsmi* (in all genders).

[2] For these examples vide Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, para 944- b.c.

[3] Ibid. para 945.

[4] Ag- P. 154.6.

[5] *liṅ-nimitte lṛṅ kriyātipattau* ; *bhūte ca*, Pāṇ. 3.3.139-140.

[6] *vidhi-liṅ* in future *kriyātipatti* has been enjoined (Pāṇ. 3.3.156), but not in past *kriyātipatti*.

pari-hīyeta kiṁ tasya
yadi jīvet sa pārthivaḥ ? MBh.[1]

yadi no pra-ṇayed rājā
daṇḍaṁ daṇḍyeṣvatandritaḥ,
śūle matsyān ivāpakṣyan
durbalān balavat-tarāḥ.
adyāt kākaḥ puroḍāśaṁ
śvāva'lihyād dhavis tathā,
svāmyañ ca na syāt kasmiṁścit
pra-vartetādharottaram. —Mn.[2]

Dhṛtarāṣṭrasya tanayān
kṛta-vairān pade pade,
rājā na cen niṣeddhā syāt
kaḥ kṣameta tavānujaḥ. —Veṇīs.[3]

(iii) *lakāras* other than *luṅ* with *mā.*

Though *luṅ* has been fixed as the only *lakāra* to go with *mā*, yet many other *lakāras*, notably *loṭ*, are met with in this case ; e.g.,

(*a*) *loṭ*—

mā kuru dhana- jana-
yauvana-garvam. —Moham.

mā te saṅgo' stvakrmaṇi. —G.[4]

anvartha-nāmā bhava me
putra mā vyartha-nāmakaḥ. —MBh.[5]

(*b*) *laṭ*—

snuṣeyaṁ tava kalyāṇa
striyaṁ mā hantum arhasi. —Bhāg.[6]

(*c*) *laṅ*—

mā putram anu-tapyathāḥ. —MBh.[7]

mā bibheḥ, na mariṣyasi. —RV.[7]

---

[1] MBh., Ādi. 42. 39-40.
[2] Mn. 7. 20-21.
[3] Veṇīs. 1.9.
[4] G. 2.47.
[5] MBh., *Vidulā-Sañjayopākhyāna.*
[6] Bhāg. 10.4.4.
[7] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 579 a.

(*d*) *lṛṭ*—

etat sarvaṁ kariṣyāmi
mā viṣādaṁ gamiṣyatha. —Matsy-P.[1]

(*e*) also rarely *vidhi-liṅ*, *āśīr-liṅ* and *leṭ*.[2]

The above uses of *mā* with *lakāras* other than *luṅ* are regarded as incorrect by some: *kathaṁ mā bhavatu, tasya pāpaṁ mā bhaviṣyati iti ? a-sādhur evā'yam*[3] (=Why *mā bhavatu*, etc. ? It is wrong to say so.)—says Jayāditya in Kāś. Others recognise a different *mā* in the above examples, which, they say, does not require *luṅ*.[4]

But neither view is supportable. The uses of great writers like Śaṅkara cannot be rejected as incorrect. Again, if there had been two *mās*, Pāṇini would have stated it along with the difference in their use. In case of an omission, Kātyāyana and Patañjali were sure to have done it. But this has not been done. Therefore the two -*mā* theory also cannot be maintained.

The conclusion is inevitable that the rule *māṅi luṅ* is inadequate. Other *lakāras* also are used with this particle (*mā*).

As regards the propriety of other *lakāras* with *mā* it may be said that at least *loṭ* is unavoidable. Being the imperative mood it can reasonably go with *mā*, a particle of prohibition. The aorist was once used for the purposes of *loṭ* (e.g., *garbham ā-dhāḥ*, introduce conception), and *mā* with aorist that obtains to this day is a relic of those bygone days. When *loṭ* has taken the place of *luṅ* (aorist) as imperative, it is quite natural to use *mā* with it (*loṭ*) for a negative construction.

If some other *lakāras* also can carry the imperative sense in some contexts, the negative construction with *mā* in their cases too may not be irregular.

(iv) augmented preterite with *mā*.

---

[1] Matsy- P. 186.11.

[2] Vide Whitney's Grammar, paras, 579 b, d.

[3] Vide Kāś. on Pāṇ. 3.3. 175 (*māṅi luṅ*).

[4] *kecid āhuḥ—a-ṅid aparo mā-śabdo vidyate, tasyā'yaṁ pra-yogaḥ*. (Kāś. on Pāṇ. 3.3. 175) ; *kathaṁ mā bhavatu, mā bhaviṣyatīti ? nāyaṁ māṅ, kintu mā-śabdaḥ*. (SK. on the above sūtra).

The augment is said to be not there or not added at all[1] when the particle *mā* is used. But there are instances where the augment appears; e.g.,

mā niṣāda pratiṣṭhāṁ tv .m
a-gamaḥ śāśvatīḥ samāḥ. —R.[2]

śraddhā ca no mā vya-gamat. —Mn.[3]

mā tvāṁ kālo'ty-a-gāt. —MBh.[4]

mā Vālipatham anvagāḥ. —R.[4]

Now, what is the reason of this deviation? The earlier language (i.e., Vedic) provides the clue. There the absence of augment has nothing to do with the particle *mā*. Even without *mā* unaugmented forms appear, and in spite of *mā* augment may be there.[5] This means augmentless forms could be optionally used at all times. The above examples where the augment is retained (with *mā*) are a continuation of the early tradition. The same tradition persists through the unaugmented forms (with *mā*) that have reached the classical language. It is a sheer accident that unaugmented forms and *mā* go together there. Therefore one need not be regarded as the cause of the other. But in Pāṇini *mā* has been regarded as causing augmentlessness, from which point of view *mā a-gamaḥ* etc. appear irreglar, whereas really they are not.

(v) *sma* not as a past particle.

It has been stated that the particle *sma* with *laṭ* gives the sense of the preterite.[6] But there are instances where *sma* is used with *laṭ* without any past sense; e.g.,

yaṁ sma pṛcchanti
kuha seti ghoram. —RV.[7]

rathaṁ tamomayaṁ tasya
vahanti sma su-daṁśitāḥ,
āditya-nilayo Rāhuḥ
somaṁ gacchati parvasu. —Matsy-P.[8]

---

[1] The rule *na māṅ-yoge* (Pāṇ. 6.4.74) strictly means this.

[2] R. 1.2.15.

[3] Mn. 3.259 ; also Ag- P. 117.26.

[4] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 579 e.

[5] *bahulaṁ chandasi a-māṅ-yoge' pi*, Pāṇ. 6.4.75.

[6] *laṭ sme*, Pāṇ. 3.2.118.

[7] RV. 2.12.5. ="The terrible one of whom they ask 'where is he'?"—Macdonell's translation (Vide his Vedic Reader).

[8] Matsy- P. 126.9.

upāsante sma sandhyāṁ ye
trikalaṁ hi Yudhiṣṭhira,
devāḥ sevanti tat tīrthaṁ
ye cā'nye vi-budhā janāḥ. —ibid.[1]

atṛpto'smyadya kāmānāṁ
Brahman duhitari sma te. —Bhāg.[2]

Again, there are cases where past sense is available from *laṭ*, though there is no *sma* with it ; e.g.,

'asti kasmiṁścin nagare Sāgaradatto nāma vaṇik'.[3]
(= there was a merchant.....)
'Laghupatanako'pi kutuhalāt tat-pṛṣṭhato'nu-sarati'.[3]
(= Laghu-patanaka followed.....)
'Karaṭaka āha—kim etat ? Damanakaḥ kathayati'[4]
(= K. asked—how is this ? D. said)

(For more examples vide Bhāg. 10.15.10-14). Now from the two sets of examples above it is clear that *sma* cannot give the past sense. If it could, then how is it that there is no past sense in the first group of examples, where *sma* is present, and there is the past sense in the second group, where *sma* is not present ? Therefore it is to be admitted that where *sma* is present with *laṭ* and the sense is past, its presence is a mere accident, so that it is all the same whether the *sma* is retained there or not. For example, —*tadā Vikramādityo nāma rājā rājyaṁ karoti sma*, or simply..... *rājyaṁ karoti* has the same value.

The use of *sma* may sometimes be helpful in knowing the past sense of *laṭ* quickly, but it is not essential for making that sense which is independent of *sma*.

Even with past tense *sma* is found, which too shows the indifference of *sma* to any sense of the past ; e.g.,

ruruduḥ sma narā nāryaḥ. —Bhāg.[5]

baddhāñjalir vi-rajasāv-
idam ucatuḥ sma. —ibid.[6]

itthaṁ sma pṛṣṭaḥ sa tu Vādarāyaṇiḥ. —ibid.[7]

---

[1] ibid. 107.30.
[2] Bhāg. 9.18.39.
[3] Pañcat., Bk. II.
[4] ibid. For more examples vide Bhāg. 10.15. 10-14 ; also cf. *vasanti iha purā chātrāḥ*, etc. under Pāṇ. 3.2. 120-122.
[5] Bhāg. 6.15.60.
[6] ibid. 10.10.28.
[7] ibid. 10.12.44.

61. MISCELLANEOUS

(i) *vasanti iha purā chātrāḥ.*

It has been stated that in connection with the indeclinable *purā*, *laṭ* can be used to denote a past action.[1]

In another place a further statement is that with the same indeclinable (*purā*) *laṭ* is to be used to denote a future action.[2]

Now, both past and future can be expressed by *laṭ* in connection with *purā*. Then the problem arises of determining the actual tense or sense of a given *laṭ*-with-*purā*. For example, what is the meaning of the sentence quoted above ? It can mean two things : (*a*) Students lived here formerly, and (*b*) Students will live here in near future.

To avoid this ambiguity the writers of Sanskrit have established a usage of their own regardless of the grammatical rules. They employ a real past tense (*laṅ*, *luṅ* etc.), if the action is past, even though *purā* is used in the sentence. *Laṭ* is never used with *purā* in the past sense, though that is allowed in grammar.[3] In the examples given here *laṅ*, *luṅ*, *liṭ* and the suffix *-kta* have been used with *purā*, but not *laṭ*.

---

[1] *puri luṅ ca a sme*, Pāṇ. 3.2.122.

[2] *yāvat-purā-nipātayor laṭ*, ibid. 3.3.4.

[3] Some examples may be noted :

ṛṣīṇāṁ vadatāṁ pūrvaṁ
śrutam āsīd yathā purā. —MBh. Anu., 10.3.

Vatsasya hyabhiśaptasya
purā bhrātrā yavīyasā
nāgnir dadāha romā'pi..... —Mn. 8. 116.

rājarṣi-pravaraḥ purā
varṇānāṁ saṁkaraṁ cakre. —ibid. 9.67.

idaṁ sarvaṁ purā sṛṣṭer
ekam evā'dvitīyakam,
sad evāsīn nāma-rūpe
nāstām..... —Pañcad. 2.14.

purā kalpe etad āsīt. —Mbhāṣ I.

āsīt kalpa-taru-cchāyām
āśritā Surabhiḥ pathi. —Ragh. 1.75.

purā sa darbhāṁkura-mātra-vṛttiḥ
samādhi-bhītena kilopanītaḥ..... —ibid. 13.39.

ahaṁ janmāntare'bhūvaṁ
kā'pi vidyādharī purā. —Kathāṣ. 26.169.

When, however, *purā* has the meaning of 'in future', *laṭ* is used in connection with it as required in grammar.[1]

This, then, is the literary tradition: To use the past tenses (*laṅ*, *luṅ*, *liṭ*, and the past participle) with *purā* meaning 'formerly', 'in ancient times'; and to use *laṭ* when *purā* has a future meaning.

Thus the rule providing for *laṭ* with *purā* (= formerly) is in fact invalid.[2]

(ii) *loṭ* in all tenses.

It is stated that *loṭ* is used for all tenses if repetition of action is there.[3] For example, in—

purīm ava-skanda, lunīhi Nandanaṁ
muṣāṇa ratnāni, harā'marāṅganāḥ,
vi-gṛhya cakre.....

Here *ava-skanda, lunīhi, muṣāṇa* and *hara* (all *loṭ*-forms) are said to denote repetition of actions in the past—*he scaled, cut, stole and kidnapped repeatedly.*

---

purā' bhūd dharidattākhyaḥ
Kambojākhye pure dvijaḥ. —ibid. 26. 195.

Yajña-sthalākhye ko'pyāsīd
agrahāre purā dvijaḥ. —ibid. 28. 156.

purā sarasi mānase.....
yasya yātaṁ vayaḥ. —Bhām. 1.2.

[1] Vide the following examples :—

purā sapta-dvīpāṁ jayati vasudhām—Śak. Act. IV.
āloke te nipatati purā sā. —Megh. 2.22.

eṣa.....
pāṣāṇa-naur iva
nimajjayate purā tvām. —Kumār. 17. 15.

sandhatsva purā na naśyasi. —Śiś. 16. 56.

tāṁ mṛṣṭa-hema-varṇābhāṁ
Sītāṁ darśaya parvata,
purā śilā-sitair vāṇair
mā tvāṁ vi-dhvaṁsayāmyaham. —Quoted in SW. (on *purā*).

[2] In a few Vedic passages *purā* is seen with *laṭ* in a past sense. This seems to have been the basis of Pāṇini's rule. But the custom has died out in post-Vedic Sanskrit.

[3] *kriyā-samabhihāre loṭ* etc., Pāṇ. 3.4. 2-5.

But it is needless to assume such a sense in *loṭ*. The normal sense (of *loṭ*) is enough to explain such passages. The *loṭ* forms in such passages must be regarded as direct quotations from the utterances of a crowd. *Ava-skanda*, *hara* etc. in the quoted stanza are certainly the cries of the advancing army of the demons that captured heaven. It is quite natural on the part of an advancing or victorious army, especially of the demons, to give out cries like '*strike strike, cut cut, kill kill, kidnap kidnap*' and so on, and the imperative mood or sense of these cries cannot be questioned in any circumstances.

Bhaṭṭojī has remarked that it is wrong to find second person singular (*loṭ*) in *ava-skanda* etc. (*purīm ava-skandetyādi madhyama-puruṣaikavacanam ityapi keṣāṁcid bhrama eva*). But the fact is too obvious to be denied. Besides, if it is not 2nd per. sing., what number and person are to be assigned here ? A verb form must be in a definite person and number.

THE USE OF CASE-ENDINGS

UN-PĀṆINIAN USE OF CASE-ENDINGS
UNACCOUNTED FOR CASE-ENDINGS
QUESTIONABLE EXPLANATIONS
EXCLUSION OF SYNONYMS
VAGUENESS ABOUT THE USE OF ṢAṢṬHĪ

62. UN-PĀṆINIAN USE OF CASE-ENDINGS

Numerous cases are there in which Pāṇinian rules regarding the use of case-endings have not been obeyed. Such cases occur mainly in the early literature (Vedic and Epic or Purāṇic), but are not rare in later literature also. Where ono case-ending has been enjoined in Pāṇini, a different one appears in such cases. Some of these cases are noted below :

(1) *dvitīyā*

(*i*) *adhikaraṇe*

The seventh case-ending alone is prescribed for this by the Sūtrakāra, and the Vārtikakāra, though noting the second case-ending also (e.g., *Kurūn svapiti* etc.), withheld his recognition of the fact. Instead he declared them as simple cases of the accusative[1] (where *dvitīyā* is normal). Besides, not all the cases were noticed by him. While he noticed *dvitīyā* only in connection with intransitive roots, it occurs with transitive roots also ; e.g.,

ekaṁ kālaṁ tu bhuñjāno
māṁsaṁ bhūmi-patir bhavet. —Matsy-p.[2]

daśamyuttar-kālaṁ putrasya jātasya nāma vi-dadhyāt. —Mbhāṣ.[3]

Kālam in these passages means *kāle*, but this is used with the transitive verbs *bhuj-* and *vi-dhā-* . Therefore the condition *a-karmaka-dhātubhir yoge* (=in connedtion with intransitive verbs) is to be waived. When this is done, the rule '*deśaḥ kālo bhāvo gantavyo'dhvā ca karma*' (= space, time etc. are *karma*) comes into conflict with *ādhāro'dhikaraṇam*,[4] for *deśa*, *kāla*, *bhāva*, *adhvā* — all are *ādhāra*-s. Yet Kātyāyana has no quarrel over the *ādharo'dhikaraṇam* sūtra. Therefore the rule *deśa kāla karma* will be automatically barred. Then in *Kurūn svapiti* etc. *Kuru* will remain *adhikaraṇa*, and the *dvitīyā* will be *adhikaraṇe dvitīyā*.

---

[1] *a-karmaka-dhātubhir yoge deśaḥ kālo bhāvo gantavyo 'dhvā ca kārma-saṁjñaka iti vācyam.* (Vārt. on Pāṇ. 1.4.51 : *akathitaṁ ca.*)

[2] Matsy-P. 105.40.

[3] Mbhās.I.

[4] Pāṇ. 1.4.45.

Besides, there are many more examples[1] of this than are noted in the commentaries. Traditionally only a few sentences *Kurūn svapiti, māsam āste* etc. are cited as examples. But when all other examples are considered, that are recorded in literature, it becomes quite clear that these are nothing but examples of *adhikaraṇe dvitiyā* instead of *saptamī*, and not *karmaṇi dvitīyā*, which could somehow be admitted, if the cases were limited to those cited in the commentaries.

Besides, the following words, treated as adverbs, actually have accusative ending in *adhikdraṇa :*

naktam, pūrvam, prakāśam, janāntikam, sāyam etc.

Adhikaraṇe dvitīyā occurs also in *vanam adhi-vasati* etc., which was noted by Pāṇini himself. He explained it as *karmaṇi dvitīyā.*[2]

(ii) with *ā*

kīrtanān mucyate pāpād
dṛṣṭvā bhadrāṇi paśyati,
ava-gāhya ca pītvā tu
punāty ā saptamaṁ kulam. —Matsy-P.[3]

---

[1] Some examples are :

yām rātriṁ jāyate jīvo
yāṁ rātriṁ ca vi-naśyati. —MBh. Anu, 9.4.

ahaṁ vanam idaṁ dur-gaṁ
Virādho nāmo rākṣasaḥ,
carāmi..... —R. 3.2.12.

vrkṣa-mūlam upāviśat. —Bhāg. 3.4.3.

Māghasyāmala-pakṣe tu
pañcamyāṁ laghu-bhuṅ naraḥ.
danta-kāṣṭhaṁ tataḥ kṛtvā
ṣaṣṭhīm upa-vased budhaḥ. —Matsy-P. 78.2

kāka-śaṅkī bhaven nityam
a-jñātāṁ vasatiṁ vaset. —Ag.-P. 225.30.

saṁskārottara-kālaṁ Brāhmaṇā
vyākaraṇaṁ smādhīyate. —Mbhāṣ. I

[2] Please see the section Questionable Explanations, No. 64(v) below for further discussion.

[3] Matsy-P. 103.14.

(iii) with *ā-rabhya*[1]

ā-rabhya bhavato janma
yāvan Nandābhiṣecanam,..... —Bhāg.[2]

Bhīṣma-caṇḍikam ā- rabhya
Parvateśvaram antike —Matsy-P.[3]

(iv) *kṛd-yoge karmaṇi*

Madra-rājaṁ tu samare
dṛṣṭvā yuddhāya viṣṭitam,
Kuravaḥ saṁ-ny-a-vartanta
mṛtyuṁ kṛtvā ni-vartanam. —MBh.[4]

māṁ kāmena —AV.[5]

yajathāya devān —RV.[6]

taṁ ni-vāraṇe —MBh.[7]

svamāṁsam iva bhojane —R.[7]

(v) with *krudh-*

ā- kroṣṭā krudhyate rājan. —MBh.[8]

This is a passive sentence. The active form becomes : *ā-kroṣṭāraṁ krudhyati.*

(vi) *tādarthye*

tataḥ kṣudhā su-sañjātā
bhikṣām aṭitum āgataḥ. —Matsy-P.[9]

ekadā dhanur udyamya
vi-caran mṛgayāṁ vane —Bhāg.[10]

(vii) with *dik-śabda : pratyañc (añcuttara-pada)*

Agniḥ.....pratyaṅṅ uṣasaṁ.....vi-bhāti. —RV.[11]

---

[1] *pañcamī* is said to occur with *ārabhya.* (Vide SK. on Pāṇ. 2.3.29).
[2] Bhāg. 12.2.26.
[3] Matsy-P. 182-63.
[4] MBh., Śalya. 9.7.
[5] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 272.
[6] ibid. para 271 h.
[7] loc. cit.
[8] MBh., Anu. 119.36.
[9] Matsy-P. 184.26
[10] Bhāg. 1.18.24.
[11] RV. 5.28.1.

(viii) with *dviṣ-*[1]

yān ahaṁ dveṣmi
ye ca mām. —AV.[2]

nānu-dveṣṭi kaliṁ sam-rāṭ. —Bhāg.[3]

(ix) with *prabhṛti*[4]

janma prabhṛti rāja-putrān rakṣet. —Arth-Ś.[5]

janma prabhṛti pāpiṣṭhau
ku-karmāṇau dṛḍha-vratau. —Matsy-P.[6]

tasya janma prabhṛtyaiva
Śarve bhaktir anuttamā. —ibid.[7]

It may be argued that *janma prabhṛti* is a *pañcamī-samāsa* in the above examples. But how is it that in all the three examples this should uniformly be a compound? The Bhāṣya has *kārtikyāḥ prabhṛti*[8] (uncompounded, obviously because there is no rule for such compound), and there is also *dvitīyā* with *ā-rabhya* (*ā-rabhya bhavato janma* etc., quoted above). Hence *janma prabhṛti* in the above sentences need not be a compound with *pañcamī* dropped, but may be uncompounded with *janma* having 2nd case-ending. If ,however, compound is admitted here, the question of un-Pāṇinian case-ending will of course be solved, but then the compound itself will become un-Pāṇinian, there being no rule for it.

(x) with *bhī-*

ā-pannaḥ saṁ-sṛtiṁ ghorāṁ
yan nāma vi-vaśo gṛṇan,
tataḥ sadyo vi-mucyeta
yad bibheti svayaṁ bhayam. —Bhāg.[9]

bhīr api yad bibheti. —ibid.[10]

---

[1] *dviṣ-* being synonymous with *druh-* requires *caturthī.* (by Pāṇ. 1.4.37 and 3.2.13).

[2] AV. 3.6.1. A similar example occurs in VS. 16.64 (...*yaṁ dviṣmaḥ* etc.).

[3] Bhāg. 1.18.7.

[4] On the authority of the Mahā-bhāṣya 5th case-ending is required with this.

[5] Arth-Ś. 1.16.3.

[6] Matsy-P. 99.25.

[7] ibid. 179.6.

[8] Mbhās. on *apādāne pañcamī*, Pān. 2.3.28.

[9] Bhāg. 1.1.14.

[10] ibid. 1.8.31.

(xi) with word denoting capability : *śakta*

ahaṁ mad-bhrātaraś caiva
Sātyakiś ca mahā-rathaḥ,
Pāñcālaḥ Sṛñjayāś caiva
na śaktāḥ sma hi Madrapam. —MBh.[1]

(xii) *sampradāne*—

ā-jagmuḥ pitaras tuṣṭāḥ
kila dātuñ ca tāṁ varam. —Matsy-P.[2]

taṁ devāḥ sarve arpitāḥ. —Kaṭh-Up.[3]

(xiii) with *spṛh-*

naikātmatāṁ me spṛhayanti kecin
mat-pāda-sevā'bhi-ratā madīhāḥ. —Bhāg.[4]

Here *dvitīyā* may be defended by assuming *prakarṣa* according to Bhaṭṭojī, but since there is no clue for it in the Bhāṣya, and Kāśikā also is silent on it, such assumption is hardly justified.

Also—

(xiv) with *iti*

ajñaṁ hi bālam ityāhuḥ. —Mn.[5]

(xv) with *lajj-*

lajjate hyeṣa putram. —Pañcar.[6]

Here there is *dvitīyā* with *iti* and *lajj-*, whereas *prathamā* and *pañcamī* are prescribed.[7]

(2) *tṛtīyā*

(i) *adhikaraṇe*

In words like *uttareṇa, dakṣiṇena, savyena, madhyena, pūrveṇa, pareṇa ;* also—*divā, doṣā, purā.*

Uttereṇa, madhyena etc. = *uttare, madhye* etc.

---

[1] MBh., Śalya. 12.39.

[2] Matsy-P. 14.4.

[3] Kaṭh-Up. 2.1.9.

[4] Bhāg. 3.25.34.

[5] Mn. 2.153.

[6] Pañcar. 2.40.

[7] Vide Kaumudī. This is, however, not stated in any rule by the three sages.

In Pāṇini the suffix *-enap* is admitted to explain some of these forms (*uttareṇa* etc.). This is obviously not to recognise *adhikaraṇe tṛtīyā*. But *tṛtīyā* is too manifest here to be rejected. Besides, *savyena, madhyena* etc. are not said to have the suffix *-enap*.[1] So they are in *tṛtīyā*[2] and if this is admitted of these words, the same may be said of other words also (*uttareṇa* etc.). Actually the *tṛtīyā* in these words is admitted by modern scholars.[3]

(ii) *apādāne*

(*a*) *a-śatrur januṣā sanād asi.* —RV.[4]

(*b*) *januṣāndha*

Here *januṣā* really means 'from birth'.

(iii) with *ṛte*

ṛte dadhi-ghṛteneha
na yajñaḥ sam-pra-vartate. —MBh.[5]

---

1 *-enap* is said to occur in *uttareṇa, dakṣiṇena* and *adhareṇa* (Pāṇ. 5.3.35 : *enap anyatarasyām* etc.).

2 Besides, the *pañcamī* in connection with them (vide examples below) also shows that there is no *-enap*, which governs 2nd and 6th case-endings.

3 Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 1112.

Some passages containing these words are :

ata ūrdhvaṁ pra-vaksyāmi
Magadhā ye Bṛhad-ratāḥ,
pūrveṇa ye Jarā-sandhāt
Sahadevānvaye nṛpāḥ. —Matsy-P. 270.17-18.

madhyena tu caruṁ sthāpya
pārśve paṅktiṁ pra-mārjayet. —Ag-P. 69.4.

yadā pratyuṣa-kālena
vi-parītodayo bhavet. —Śivas. 82.

garbhasya spaṣṭatā-jñāne
savanaṁ spandanāt purā. —Matsy-P. 153.2.

krītvā vi-krīya vā kiñcid
yasyehānuśayo bhavet,
so 'ntar-daśāhāt tat-svāmī
dadyāc caivādadīta ca,
pareṇa tu daśāhasya
nādadyān naiva dāpayet. —Ag-P. 227. 13-14.

4 RV. 1. 102.8.

5 MBh., Anu. 83.2.

(iv) *kṛd-yoge kartari*

Vārāṇasī-Jāhnavībhyāṁ
saṅgame loka-vi-śrute. —Matsy-P.[1]

tathā sa tu samudro'pi
vartate śaśinodaye. —ibid.[2]

(v) *kṛd-yoge karmaṇi*

yena saṁsparśāt kartuḥ
śarīra-sukham. —Pāṇ.[3]

This being an use by Pāṇini himself, this makes the rule (*karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī* with *kṛt*)[4] optional, though laid down as compulsory.

(vi) with *tṛp-* (*suhitārtha dhātu*)

nātṛpyat sārvabhaumaḥ
kad-indriyaiḥ. —Bhāg.[5]

(vii) with *tras-*

yatra siṁha-ni-nādena
trastānāṁ bhairavaṁ ravaṁ. —Matsy-P.[6]

(viii) *bhāve*

na tvayā'tra mayā'va-sthitena
kāpi cintā kāryā. —Pañcat.[7]

(ix) with *bhī-*

ātmīyān darśayed āśāṁ
yena doṣeṇa bibhyati. —Ag-P.[8]

jarayā bibheti. —Kaṭh-Up.[9]

(3) *caturthī*

(i) *atyanta-saṁ -yoge*

nātyantāya ajñānaṁ śaraṇaṁ
bhavitum arhati. —Mbhāṣ.[10]

---

[1] Matsy-P. 116.13.
[2] ibid. 122.32.
[3] Pāṇ. 3.3.116.
[4] ibid. 2.3.65.
[5] Bhāg. 9.18.51.
[6] Matsy-P. 116.13.
[7] Quoted in Whitney's Grammar, para 281 g.
[8] Ag-P. 226.10.
[9] Kaṭh-Up. 1.1.12.
[10] Mbhāṣ. I.

(ii) *kṛd-yoge kartari*

Prajā-patīnāṁ patir eṣa mahyaṁ
paraṁ pramāṇaṁ bhagavān anantaḥ. —Bhāg.[1]

(iii) with *prati*

śṛṇu devi vaco mahyaṁ
yādṛśaṁ pratyupasthitaḥ. —Matsy-P.[2]

(4) *pañcamī*

(i) *adhikaraṇe*

uttarād vasati,
dakṣiṇād vasati;
tata uttarasmāt —ibid.[3]

(ii) with *anu*

hitvā kalevaraṁ tīrthe
Gaṅgāyāṁ darśanād anu. —Bhāg.[4]

(iii) *apavarge*

harati nimeṣāt kālaḥ sarvam. —Moham.

praṇati-brahmacaryopasarpaṇāni
kṛtvā siddhir bahu-kālāt tad-vat. —Sāṁkhy.[5]

kṣaṇāt saṁ-vartate dhvaniḥ. —Pañcar.[6]

a-gacchann aho-rātrāt tīrtham. —MBh.[7]

vi-vāhitā hi cet kanyā
mriyate pitṛ-veśmani,
tasyās tri-rātrāc chudyanti
bāndhavā nātra saṁ-śayaḥ. —Ag-P.[8]

kṣatriyo nava-saptāhāc
chudhyed vipro guṇair yutaḥ,
daśāhāt sa-guṇo vaiśyo
viṁśāhāc chūdra eva ca. —ibid.[9]

---

[1] Bhāg. 3.22.20.
[2] Matsy-P. chap. 148.
[3] Bhāg. 5.22.17.
[4] ibid. 6.2.43.
[5] Samkhy-4.19.
[6] Pañcar. 2.21.
[7] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 291 b.
[8] Ag.P. 157.10-11.
[9] ibid. 158.12.

(v) with *upari*, *upariṣṭāt*[1]

tata upariṣṭāt —Bhāg.[2]

tasmād upari —Matsy-P.[3]

(iv) with *āmreḍita*[4] (*adho' dhaḥ*)

giri-śikharebhyo'dho'dhaḥ pra-sravanti. —Bhāg.[5]

(vi) *ubhaya-prāptau kartari*

duṣṭātmano vadho yatra
Kīcakasya Vṛkodarāt. —MBh.[6]

(vii) *prakṛtyādibhyaḥ*[7]

Guhyakā vata yūyaṁ vai
svabhāvāt krūra-cetasaḥ. —Matsy-P.[8]

vegād ahaṁ pra-calitaḥ pavanopameyaḥ. —Cār.[9]

(viii) with *yāvat*

kariṣye jīvite yatnaṁ
yāvad ucchvāsa-nigrahāt. —MBh.[10]

(ix) *śeṣe*[11]

krauñca-mithunād ekam avadhīḥ. —R.[12]

tebhya ekam. —Kathās.[13]

The question of *apādāne pañcamī* does not arise, because no *kriyā* is concerned.

---

[1] *ṣaṣṭhī* enjoined with these (Pāṇ. 2.3.30).

[2] Bhāg. 5.22.11, 13, 15.

[3] Matsy-P. 7.13.

[4] *dvitīyā* enjoined.

[5] Bhāg. 5.7.6.

[6] MBh., Parva-saṁgraha-parva 208.

[7] According to Mbhāṣ. (on 2.3.18) *kartari* or *karaṇe*.

[8] Matsy-P. 179.9.

[9] Cār. 1.11.

[10] MBh. Śānti. 128.38.

[11] "Occasionally an ablative is used instead of a partitive genitive." (Whitney's Sans. Gram. para 292d).

[12] R. 1.2.15.

[13] Quoted in Whitney's Grammar, para, 292 d.

(5) *ṣaṣṭhī*

(i) with *antarā*

dvayoś[1] *caiva antarā* —Mbhās.[2]

tayoś caiva antarā nadyaś ca
parvatāś ca bhavanti. —loc. cit.

vṛṣabha-kulam anayor anantarā. —MBh.[3]

(ii) with *antareṇa*

ityantareṇārjunayoḥ
Kṛṣṇas tu yamayor yayau. —Bhāg.[4]

(iii) with *āmreḍita*

uparyupari rājñāṁ vai
jvalitvā bhāskaro yathā. —MBh.[5]

(iv) with *-u*

.....Kṛṣṇa-Valayor
jighāṁsur daitya āgamat. —Bhāg.[6]

didṛkṣavo'pyacyutayoḥ
Kaṁsād bhītā na cācalan. —ibid.[7]

(v) with *-kta*

mādṛśo vāṁ vṛtaḥ sutaḥ. —ibid.[8]

śrutaṁ me Brahmaṇā proktam. —Matsy-P.[9]

(vi) with *dik-śabda*

uttaraṁ yat samudrasya
Himādreś caiva dakṣiṇam,
varṣaṁ tad Bhāratam nāma
nava-sahasra-vistṛtam. —Ag-P.[10]

---

[1] Kaiyaṭa has sought to justify the *ṣaṣṭhī* here. An use made by the Bhāṣyakāra may be justifiable. But the thing is that none of the three sages have said anything about *ṣaṣṭhi* with *antarā*. (Vide his Pradīpa).

[2] Mbhāṣ. on Pāṇ. 1.1.7.

[3] MBh. Virāṭ. 1.14.

[4] Bhāg. 10.10.26.

[5] MBh. Śalya. 4.23.

[6] Bhāg. 10.11.41.

[7] ibid. 10.23.52.

[8] ibid. 10.3.38.

[9] Matsy-P. 108.1.

[10] Ag-P. 118.1.

sarveṣām uttare Merur
Lokālokasya dakṣiṇe. —Matsy-P.[1]

yāmune cottara-kūle
Prayāgasya tu dakṣiṇe. —ibid.[2]

(vii) with *prāk*

prāk teṣāṁ vai gṛha-svāmī. —Ag-P.[3]

(viii) with *parita-s*

svādūdakasya paritaḥ,
śailas tu pari-maṇḍalaḥ. —Matsy-P.[4]

(ix) in *bhaya-hetu* (with *bhaya*)[5]

purā Indrasya vai bhayāt. —Matsy-P.[6]

saṁ-kucanti bhayāc caiva
mārjārāṇāṁ yathā śukaḥ. —ibid.[7]

dānavānāṁ bhayāt tad-vad
babhrāma pra-pitā-mahaḥ. —ibid.[8]

(x) *bhāve* (without *anādara*)

Yudhiṣṭhiras tad ā-karṇya
śayānaṁ śara-pañjare,
a-pṛcchad vi-vidhān dharmān
ṛṣīṇāṁ cānuśṛṇvatām. —Bhāg.[9]

ityuktvā 'sīd dharis tuṣṇīṁ
Bhagavān ātma-māyayā,
pitroḥ sam-paśyatoḥ sadyo
babhūva prākṛtaḥ śiśuḥ. —ibid.[10]

---

[1] Matsy- P. 125.37.

[2] ibid. 106.20.

[3] Ag-P. 247-4.

[4] Matsy-P. 122.46.

[5] *Pañcamī* with *bhaya*, *bhīta*, *bhīti*, *bhī* is a requirement. (Vide Vārt. *bhaya-bhīta-bhīti-bhībhir iti vaktavyam.* on Pāṇ. 2.1.37)

[6] Matsy. P. 120.78.

[7] ibid. 130.45.

[8] ibid. 131.6.

[9] Bhāg. 1.9.25.

[10] ibid. 10.3.46.

iti vādina evāsya
hotur ā-huti-sādhanam,
a-nindyā Nandinī nāma
dhenur ā-vavṛte vanāt. —Ragh.[1]

In these examples there is no question of *anādara* (disregard) by Yudhiṣṭhira to the Ṛṣis, by Lord Kṛṣṇa to his parents, and by Nandinī to Vasiṣṭha.

(xi) with *vinā*

na jātu Pauravendrāṇāṁ
dordaṇḍa-pari-rambhite,
bhūtale 'nu-patantyasmin
vinā te prāṇināṁ śucaḥ. —Bhāg.[2]

(xii) with *svasti*

śrutvā tannidhanaṁ svasti
śiśoś cāsan su-vi-smitāḥ. —ibid.[3]

(6) *saptamī*

(i) with *anu*

pañca-pañcāśāta medhyair
Gaṅgāyām anu vājibhiḥ,
Māmateyaṁ purodhāya
Yamunāyām anu prabhuḥ. —ibid.[4]

(ii) *apavarge*

Vāsudevasya sānnidhyaṁ
labdhvā divya-śaracchate. —ibid.[5]

(iii) *karaṇe* (with *tṛp-*, *artha*, *prayojana*)

na tṛpto viṣayeṣvaham. —ibid.[6]

vayaṁ tu na vi-tṛpyāma
uttama-śloka-vi-krame. —ibid.[7]

---

[1] Ragh. 1.82.
[2] Bhāg. 1.17.8.
[3] ibid. 10.6.42.
[4] ibid. 9.20.25.
[5] ibid. 10.10.22.
[6] ibid. 9.18.39.
[7] ibid. 1.1.19.

yāvān artha uda-pāne. —G.[1]

astyanyad Gargā'di-Vidā'di-pāṭhe proyojanam.
—Mbhāṣ.[2]

(iv) *kṛd-yoge karmaṇi*
satī-tve kāraṇaṁ striyāḥ. —Hit.

atha vā abhyupāya evā'pa-śubda-
jñānaṁ śabda-jñāne. —MBhāṣ.[3]

(v) with *kṛtya*-suffix
na Veda-vyavahāro'yaṁ
saṁ-śrāvyaḥ śūdra-jātiṣu. —Nāṭyaś.[4]

(vi) with *-kta*
bhāgyeṣu śeṣam ā-yattam. —Pratijñā-Y.[5]

(vii) with *krudh-* and synonyms
rājya-kāme mama krodho
Bharate yo babhūva ha. —R.[6]

Dama-ghoṣa-sutaḥ pāpa
ā-rabhya kala-bhāṣaṇāt,
sam-pratyamarṣī Govinde. —Bhāg.[7]

yo'smin bhrātṛ-śate roṣaḥ. —Pañcar.[8]

(viii) with *gam-* and synonyms
sa id deveṣu gacchati. —RV.[9]

Virāṭa-nagare gatvā
śmaśāne vipulāṁ śamīm. —MBh.[10]

vāmācāra-pravāhe tu
na gacchet pūrva uttare. —Śivas.[11]

---

1 G. 2.46.
2 Mbhāṣ. I.
3 Mbhāṣ. I.
4 Nāṭyaś. 1.12.
5 Pratijñā-Y. 2.5.
6 R. 3.2.25.
7 Bhāg. 7.1.17.
8 Pañcar. 1.52.
9 RV. 1.1.4.
10 MBh., Parva-saṁgraha-parva 206.
11 Śivas. 76.

gatvā' tha patnī-śālāyām ;
nadyāṁ kadācid ā-gatya. —Bhāg.[1]

Vasudevaḥ Kaṁsa-bhayād
Yaśodā-śayane'nayat,
Yaśodā-bālikāṁ gṛhya
Devakī-śayane'nayat. —Ag-P.[2]

mama bhāryāṁ śubhācārāṁ
Virādhāṅke pra-veśitām. —R.[3]

ā-gamāś ca vi-kārāś ca
pratyayāḥ saha dhātubhiḥ,
uccāryante tatas teṣu
neme prāptāḥ kalādayaḥ. —Mbhāṣ.[4]

(ix) in *gauṇa-karma*

tasya sam-mānanārthaṁ me
tvayi vākyaṁ pra-bhāṣitam. —MBh.[5]

kāmaṁ teṣu tu vi-proṣya
strīṣvivāyam ahaṁ vadet. —Mbhāṣ.[6]

ityuktā sā tu kupitā
muni-varyeṣu Śailajā
uvāca kopa-raktākṣī. —Matsy-P.[7]

priyam evā'bhi-dhātavyaṁ
satsu nityaṁ dviṣatsu ca. —Ag-P.[8]

(x) *tādarthye*

indriyāṇāṁ jaye yogaṁ
sam-ā-tiṣṭhed divā-niśam. —Mn.[9]

Kaṁso'pi Putanā'dīṁś cā-
preśayad bāla-nāśane. —Ag-P.[10]

---

[1] Bhāg. 10.23.15 ; 10.22.7.
[2] Ag-P. 12.7-8.
[3] R. 3.2.17.
[4] Mbhāṣ. I.
[5] MBh., Anu. 21.11.
[6] Mbhāṣ. I.
[7] Matsy-P. 153.342.
[8] Ag-P. 258.15.
[9] Mn. 7.44.
[10] Ag-P. 12.14.

kariṣye jīvite yatnam. —MBh.[1]

yuvāṁ vai Brahmaṇā' diṣṭau
prajā-sarge yadā tataḥ. —Bhāg.[2]

(xi) with *druh-* and synonyms

druhyen na manasā vā'pi
goṣu nityam..... —MBh.[3]

vi-dveṣo dayite putre
katham āsīn mahātmani. —Bhāg.[4]

sadṛśam etad bhrātṛ-śateṣvapi
drohiṇam. —Pañcar.[5]

sānukrośasya bandhuṣu —MBh.[6]

(xii) with *pra-bhū-*[7]

na hi tejasvināṁ śāpās
tejaḥsu pra-bhavanti vai. —MBh.[8]

(xiii) with *rucyartha* verb

dviṣanmukhe'pi svadate.....[9]

(xiv) *vikāre*

vāme'kṣṇi kāṇaḥ. —Ag-P.[10]

(xv) with *śakta*[11]

na śakto'bhavan ni-vāraṇe. —MBh.[12]

---

[1] MBh., Śānti. 128.38.

[2] Bhāg. 10.3.33.

[3] MBh., Anu. 81.34.

[4] Bhāg. 7.1.47.

[5] Pañcar. II.

[6] MBh., Śānti. 121.1.

[7] *Caturthī* is the *vibhakti* allowed here (Vide Mbhāṣ. on Pāṇ. 2.3.16). Bhaṭṭojī says *ṣaṣṭhī* also is possible on the strength of the Pāṇinian sentence—*sa eṣāṁ grāmaṇīḥ* (Vide SK. on the above sūtra). There is no clear rule in the Aṣṭādhyāyī on this question.

[8] MBh., Anu. 85.15.

[9] Quoted in p. 18 of Pañcarātra published by Chowkhamba, Varanasi, 1958.

[10] Ag-P. 143.3.

[11] *Caturthī* and *ṣaṣṭhī* are available with it (Vide SK. on Pāṇ. 2.3.16).

[12] Quoted by Whitney in his Sans. Gram. p. 102.

(xvi) *sampradāne*

ācārye dvi-guṇaṁ dadyāt. —Ag-P.[1]

vipreṣu bhojanaṁ dadyāt. —Matsy-P.[2]

kasmin dattaṁ kathaṁ yāti
śrāddhantu Madhusūdana. —ibid.[3]

saha Rāmeṇa mālā-bhṛn-
mālā-kāre varaṁ dadau. —Ag-P.[4]

vinā Kṛṣṇena tannaṣṭaṁ
dānañ cā'kṣatriye yathā. —ibid.[5]

mā-pra-yaccheśvare dhanam.
devare deyāt. Ag-P.[6]

bhārākrāntasya gurviṇyāḥ
panthā deyo guruṣvapi. —ibid.[7]

pūjyā devā dvijāḥ sarve
dadyād dānāni teṣu ca,
dvije dānam..... —ibid.[8]

ṛṇaṁ dadyāt patiṣvāsām. —ibid.[9]

yo dadyād Brāhmaṇe kiñcit
tasmin kṣetre varānane. —Matsy-P.[10]

yo dadyād Brāhmaṇe Veda-pārage. —ibid.[11]

Sampradāne saptamī, however, is admitted by Patañjali who says: '*yaddhi yasmai dīyate tasminnapi tad dīyate*'.[12] On this Kaiyaṭa says: '*sampradānam eva dāna-kriyāpekṣayā adhikaraṇatvena vivakṣyate, yathā 'samam a-Brāhmaṇe dānam*'."[13]

---

1 Ag-P. 70.8.
2 Matsy-P. 100.47.
3 ibid. 16.3.
4 Ag-P. 12.24.
5 ibid. 15.11.
6 Ag-P. 154.5-6. The full stanza is: *naṣṭe mṛte pravrajite klīve ca patite patau, pañcasvāpatsu nārīṇāṁ patir anyo vidhīyate, mṛte tu devare deyāt tadabhāve yathecchayā.*
7 ibid. 155.14.
8 ibid. 225.23.
9 ibid. 254.8.
10 Matsy-P. 182.70.
11 ibid. 182.73.
12 Mbhāṣ. on Pāṇ. 5.1.47, Vārt. 1.
13 Pradīpa on the above Bhāṣya.

(xvii) *hetau*[1]

made ahim Indra jaghāna. —RV.[2]

a-nir-vṛtam ivā'tmānam manyamāna
ātma-nirvede idam āha. —Bhāg.[3]

na mām a-kāraṇe śaptuṁ
tvam ihā'rhasi mānada. —Matsy-P.[4]

cerur daitya-vadhe hṛṣṭāḥ. —ibid[5]

puruṣa-tvaṁ hṛtaṁ sarvaṁ
strī-rūpe vi-smito nṛpaḥ. —ibid[6].

Karṇasya ni-dhane hṛṣṭaḥ. —MBh.[7]

śabdasya jñāne dharma
āhosvit prayoge ;.....
sarva-Veda-puṇya-phalā'vāptiś-
cāsya jñāne bhavati. —Mbhāṣ.[8]

The above are some of the instances where a different case-ending appears in place of one enjoined in Pāṇini.

---

[1] Pāṇini has allowed (i) *tṛtīyā* in a general *hetu* (cause), (ii) *pañcamī* in a *ṛṇa* or *guṇa hetu* (cause), and (iii) *ṣaṣṭhī* (sometimes *tṛtīyā*) in a *hetu* (purpose, cause) accompanied by the word *hetu*. Vide Pāṇ. 2.3.23-27.

His successor Kātyāyana admits all the seven case-endings in *hetu* (iii) noted above in a much wider sphere, i.e., not only in connection with the single word *hetu*, but its synonyms also (*nimitta-paryāya-prayoge sarvāsāṁ prāya-darśanam.*, Vārt. on Pāṇ. 2.3.27). He also admits (iv) *saptamī* in a *hetu* (purpose), called by him *nimitta*, which is physically connected with the *karma* (*nimittāt karma-yoge*, Vārt. on Pāṇ. 2.3.36.).

Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣita thinks *pañcamī* is available in a general *hetu* (i) by a *yoga-vibhāga* in Pāṇ. 2.3.25 (*vibhāṣeti yoga-vibhāgād a-guṇe striyāñca kvacit*).

But *saptamī* in a general *hetu* is not stated by any. The cited examples are all of general *hetu* taking *saptamī*.

[2] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 303.

[3] Bhāg. 5.1.36.

[4] Matsy-P. 4.13.

[5] ibid. 152.27.

[6] ibid. 11.48.

[7] MBh., Śalya. 6.44.

[8] Mbhāṣ. I.

Again, in *nadī*, *latā*, *vāk* etc. (nom. sing.) no case-ending at all appears, though Pāṇini requires *prathamā* in *prātipadikārtha*.[1] These words well carry their *prātipadikārtha* without the *prathamā* (Further details in the chapters on Terms and Elision).

63. UNACCOUNTED FOR CASE-ENDINGS

In a number of cases case-endings cannot be accounted for by any rules. In the previous section cases have been noticed of one case-ending appearing for a different one prescribed in a particular sense or in connection with a particular word. Here those cases will be noted about which nothing has been said. For example, *saptamī* is seen in connection with *apa-rādh-*, *vi-śvas-*, but nothing has been said about it. These require to be noted.

Following are the most important of such cases :

(i) *antar—pañcamī* is seen in connection with this word ; e.g.,

so'ntar daśāhāt tat-svāmī
dadyāc caivā'dadīta ca. —Ag-P.[2]

(ii) *apa-rādh—*

dvitīyā, *caturthī* and *saptamī* are seen with this verb ;

dvitīyā—

eka-jātir dvi-jātin tu
yenā'ṅgenā'parādhnuyāt. —Matsy-P.[3]

caturthī—

na dūye Sātvatī-sūnur
yan mahyam apa-rādhyati. —Śiś.[4]

saptamī—

kasminn api pūjārhe'parāddhā
tatra-bhavatī Śakuntalā. —Śak.[5]

(iii) *āvis* (r)—This governs *caturthī* :

āvir ebhyo'bhavat sūryaḥ ; —RV.[6]

āvir āvir ma edhi. —Upaniṣad.

---

[1] *prātipadikārtha-liṅga-parimāṇa-vacana-mātre prathamā*, Pāṇ. 2.3.46.

[2] Ag-P. 227.13-14 (Also quoted before).

[3] Matsy-P. 226.83.

[4] Śiś. 2.11.

[5] Śak. Act IV.

[6] Vide Whitney's Grammar, para 286b.

(iv) *vi-śvas-, snih-* (These govern *saptamī*).

putre snihyati, na viśvased a-viśvaste etc.

(v) miscellaneous words :

adhīra— (takes *pañcamī*)

Kaṁsād aham adhīra-dhīḥ. —Bhāg.[1]

kāmārta— (takes *saptamī*)

upa-gūha ca māṁ vipra
kāmārtā'haṁ bhṛśaṁ tvayi. —MBh.[2]

bhakta— (takes *ṣaṣṭhī, saptamī*).

Kaunteya prati-jānīhi
na me bhaktaḥ pra-ṇaśyati. —G.[3]

ye bhaktā bhāskare devi
loka-nāthe divākare. —Matsy-P.[4]

(vi) *samantatas*— (takes *ṣaṣṭhī*)

dhanuḥ-śataṁ pari-ṇāho
grāmasya tu samantataḥ. —Ag-P.[5]

(vii) Cognate object—This has not been spoken of. But this occurs in literature and takes the usual accusative ending.

a-śāstra-vi-hitaṁ ghoraṁ
tapyante ye tapo janāḥ. —G.[6]

kathaṁ Virāṭa-nagare
mama pūrva-pitāmahāḥ,
a-jñāta-vāsam uṣitā
Duryodhana-bhayārditāḥ. —MBh.[7]

sa vi-nadya mahā-nādam ; —R.[8]

śara-varṣaṁ vavarṣatuḥ. —ibid.[9]

---

[1] Bhāg. 10.3.29.
[2] MBh., Anu. 19.82.
[3] G. 9.31.
[4] Matsy-P. 182.102.
[5] Ag-P. 227.19.
[6] G. 17.5.
[7] MBh., Virāṭ. 1.1.
[8] R. 3.2.12.
[9] ibid. 3.3.15.

(viii) endings in various senses :

after—

saptāhena yadā yātrā
bhaviṣyati mahī-pateḥ. —Ag-P.[1]

Here *saptāhena*=after a week. This is not *apavarge tṛtīyā*, for the action (*yātrā*) is not complete, but is only starting (after a week).

for—

gambhīre cid bhavati
gādham asmai. —RV.[2]

Here *asmai*=for him. This is not explainable by *kriyārthopapadasya ca....*[3] or *kriyayā yam abhi-praiti* etc.,[4] for here there is no *kriyā* at all. The verb *bhū-* is negligible.

Some other instances are :

ko bhāgo mahyaṁ bhaviṣyati. —ŚBr.[5]

Indra tubhyam id a-bhūma. —TS.[5]

to—

vayaṁ karma-karīs tubhyaṁ
śādhi naḥ karavāma kim. —Bhāg.[6]

dhārayiṣyasi cet tubhyaṁ
Śakrahā bhavitā sutaḥ. —ibid.[7]

Also there is no rule for *hetau pañcamī*.[8] But *pancamī* in this sense is frequently used, such as *duḥkhād roditi, dhūmād agnimān* etc.

64. QUESTIONABLE EXPLANATIONS

There are some cases where the explanations offered for a case-ending is not satisfactory, and a more satisfactory explanation is possible. Following are the cases :

(i) (a) *droṇo vrīhiḥ*

Here the *prathamā* in *droṇa* is said to be in the sense of *parimāṇa*.[9] This is not so. It is in *prātipadikārtha*. The sense of *parimāṇa* comes from

---

1 Ag-P. 236.1.
2 RV. 6.24.8.
3 Pāṇ. 2.3.14.
4 Vārt. on Pāṇ. 1.4.32.
5 Vide Macdonell's *Vedic Grammar for Students*, para 200,0.
6 Bhāg. 3.23.27.
7 ibid. 6.18.54.
8 For details vide foot-note under *hetau* (Sec. 62 xvii) above.
9 Vide SK. on Pāṇ. 2.3.46.

lakṣaṇā. The words *droṇaḥ* and *vrīhiḥ* (both nouns) as subject and predicate of a senetence give no sense. Hence the need arises for taking *droṇaḥ* as *droṇa-parimitaḥ*, as in *gaur vāhīkaḥ*, *gauḥ* is explained as *go-sadṛśa* (cow-like). This is a clear case of *lakṣaṇā*.

If *parimāṇa* also is to be got from the *prathamā*, then any *prathamā* can claim that sense, but that is impossible. Then how to decide whether a given *prathamā* has that sense or not ? It is certainly the incompatibility of the *prātipadikārtha* (may be called *mukhyārtha*, and Pāṇini also has mentioned it first), and that is the road to *lakṣaṇā*.

(b) *uccaiḥ, nīcaiḥ*

In these words *prathamā* in *prātipadikārtha* is admitted.[1] But the case-ending is *tṛtīyā*, not *prathamā*, in these words. The bases are *ucca*, *nīca*, whence in instr. plur. the forms *uccaiḥ*, *nīcaiḥ*.[2] If these are to be regarded as *prathamā* simply because they are in the *avyaya* list, then all other like formations, such as *ciram*, *cireṇa*, *cirāya*, *cirasya*, *paścāt* etc. should also be so regarded (i.e., *prathamā*). But that is impossible. Hence *uccaiḥ* and *nīcaiḥ* should not be cited as instances of *prathamā* under the rule, *prātipadikārtha-liṅga* etc.

Yet Patañjali has even declined *uccaiḥ* in dual and plural numbers (*aty-uccaisau*, *aty-uccaisaḥ*)[3] as if it (*uccaiḥ*) was a perfect nom. sing. form. In spite of that the instr. ending in the word is too manifest to be denied. Kaiyaṭa, however, finds a locative sense in these words.[4]

(ii) *jaṭābhis tāpasam* etc.

The *tṛtīyā* here is said to be *itthambhūta-lakṣaṇe*. But this is unnecessary. Either *karaṇa* or *hetu* can explain it. The sentence is obviously elliptical for *jaṭābhis tāpasaṁ jānāti* (*a-jānāt*, *apaśyat* etc.). Hence *jaṭā* is the *karaṇa* of *jñā-* (etc.). Or *jaṭābhiḥ* may be elliptical for *jaṭābhir yuktaḥ*.

If, however, the sense is 'he is an ascetic by virtue of his matted hair',[5] that is to say, 'he has no other saintly virtue except his matted hair,' then *jaṭā* is a clear *hetu*.

---

[1] Vide Mbhāṣ., Kāś. and SK. on *prātipadikārtha-liṅga-parimāṇa-vacanamātre prathamā*, Pāṇ. 2.3.46.

[2] For Instrumental and other case-forms used as *avyaya*s vide Whitney's Grammar, paras 1110-1117.

[3] Mbhāṣ. on Pāṇ. 1.1.37.

[4] *uccair nīcair iti saptamyarthe vartate*—vide Pradīpa on Mbhāṣ. on Pāṇ. 1.1.37.

[5] Cf. Beng. *kāj-e Kāẕī nay, dāḍi-te Kāẕī* (—He is not a Kazi by his deeds, but by his beard only).

(iii) *ahaṁ tvāṁ kukkurāya manye.*

This is said to be *karmaṇi caturthī* : *kukkurāya=kukkuram.* But it is not understandable why *karma* should take *caturthī* here. The sentence may be regarded as elliptical for.....*kukkurāya deyam manye* (=I think you are fit for throwing to the dog)[1] ; cf. Eng. 'he is going to the dogs' (=prob. orig. 'being thrown to the dogs of the executioner'). Hence the *caturthī* is *sampradāne.* Or the *caturthī* may simply mean 'for', as in *gambhīre cid bhavati gādham asmai* (RV), so that the sentence means 'I think you are meant for the dog (of the executioner)'. In either case, the *caturthī* is in its normal function, but not so in the Pāṇinian interpretation (*karmaṇi caturthī*), where the *caturthī* is a mere substitute for *dvitīyā.*

(iv) *rudataḥ śiśor mātā jagāma*

The *ṣaṣṭhī* is said to be *anādare bhāve.* But the condition *anādare* is unnecessary. For cases are there where *bhāve ṣaṣṭhī* occurs without *anādara* ; e.g.,

Kṛṣṇasya nṛtyataḥ kecij
jaguḥ kecid a-vādayan. —Bhāg.[2]

pitroḥ sam-paśyatoḥ sadyo
babhūva prākṛtaḥ śiśuḥ. —ibid.[3]

yudhiṣṭhiras.....
a-pṛcchad vi-vidhān dharmān
ṛṣīṇāṁ cā'nuśṛṇvatām. —ibid.[4]

iti vādina evā'sya
...dhenur ā-vavṛte vanāt —Ragh.[5]

There is no question of *anādara* (disregard) towards Kṛṣṇa by the cow-herds, towards his parents by Kṛṣṇa himself, towards the listening ṛṣis by Yudhiṣṭhira, and towards the sage (Vasiṣṭha) by the cow (Nandinī) in these examples, as has already been noted.[6]

Therefore *anādara,* where it is detectable, may be regarded as purely accidental, but not essential for the sixth case-ending, which is merely *bhāve.*

---

[1] This was a form of punishment in ancient times ; cf. *śvabhiḥ saṁkhādyatām* (Mṛc.) ; *bhakṣyante vāyasādibhiḥ* (Ag-P.) ; also cf. Ag-P. 227.42 for criminals being thrown as prey to dogs.

[2] Bhāg. 10.18.10.

[3] ibid. 10.3.46.

[4] ibid. 1.9.25.

[5] Ragh. 1.82.

[6] Vide Sec. 62 (5x) above.

(v) *vanam adhi-vasati* (*adhi-śete* etc.), *Kurūn svapiti* etc.—

In the Pāṇinian interpretation these are cases of *karmaṇi dvitīyā*. But *vana*, etc. are *ādhāra* of action (*śete*, *svapiti* etc.), and hence these are *adhikaraṇa*s, and the *dvitīyā* is *adhikaraṇe dvitīyā*. An *adhikaraṇa* does not become *karma* simply because the ending is *dvitīyā*. Whatever the ending, the *kāraka* is to be determined by the sense, and the sense is that of *adhikaraṇa* here.[1]

(vi) *bhṛtyam abhi-krudhyati*

Bhṛtyam is *karmaṇi dvitīyā* according to Pāṇini. But actually *dvitīyā* is due to the preposition *abhi*; cf. *agnim abhi patanti*. It makes little difference whether the preposition is detached or compounded with the verb. For originally it was quite free; it could go before or after the verb, could be compounded or detached. Therefore it cannot be said that it does not govern a case-ending when it is compounded.

(vii) *Haraye rocate, puṣpebhyaḥ spṛhayati, bhṛtyāya krudhyati, Kṛṣṇāya īkṣate, ślāghate, śatāya pari-krītaḥ* etc.

Sampradāne caturthī is admitted in these cases. But there is no occasion for any *sampradāna* (donation) here. Nothing is being given away to anyone in such cases. Hence the question of *sampradāna* cannot arise. *Tādarthya* may be found in some of these cases; in other cases the ending means 'to', 'towards'.

(viii) *vyāghrād bibheti*

Vyāghrād is said to be *apādāne pañcamī*. But the condition of *apādāna*—*apāya*—is not necessarily present here. Hence the question of *apādāna* does not arise.[2]

65. EXCLUSION OF SYNONYMS

Synonyms of words governing case-endings are barred from governing those cases by the *pari-bhāṣā—svaṁ rūpaṁ śabdasya a-śabda-saṁjñā*.[3] (Only the stated form of a word, not its synonyms also, can be applied). Actually, however, many synonyms are used with those case-endings. For example, *tṛtīyā* with *saha* is enjoined, but *sārdham, samam, sākam* also are seen governing this case-ending. Bhāṣya is silent on it. *Pañcamī* is

---

[1] For further discussion please see Sub. Sec. 1 (i), Sec. 62 above.

[2] For further discussion please see Chap. III).

[3] Pāṇ. 1.1.68.

enjoined in connection with *anya* and *itara* ; but *bhinna* is also used. *Caturthī* is enjoined in connection with *alam*, but *śakta, samartha, prabhu* etc. also are used. This fact, however, was noticed by Kātyāyana who laid down a rule[1] for the inclusion of these words. Similar rules for other cases also were needed. But what, after all, was the necessity in restricting case-endings to the association of particular words and not their synonyms also ? It is but natural to use synonyms of words to avoid monotony. Same case-endings also are quite natural there. If it is allowable to say *tubhyaṁ svasti*, then sentences like *tubhyaṁ maṅgalam, tubhyaṁ kalyāṇam* etc. are unavoidable. They give variety and freshness to the language. Hence the door should be open for such constructions. The directive *svaṁ rūpaṁ śabdasya* etc. need not have been given such an unrestricted scope.

66. VAGUENESS ABOUT USE OF ṢAṢṬHĪ

Much vagueness has been left about the use of *ṣaṣṭhī*, for the rule does not state explicitly where this ending is to be employed ; instead it says—*śeṣe*[2] (the sixth case-ending is in the remaining cases). But what are the remainng cases ? This has stirred up endless speculations, so that *ṣaṣṭhī* is proposed anywhere and everywhere on the strength of this vague rule. Thus while *bhaje Śambhoś caraṇau* should be the correct sentence, there is instead the construction *bhaje Śambhoś caraṇayoḥ* (=lit. I worship *of the feet* of Śambhu !), and the *ṣaṣṭhī* is justified by having recourse to this rule. But how can *śeṣa* come here ? *Caraṇa* is the *karma* of *bhaj-*, and *karma* is not *śeṣa*, because it is already dealt with.[3]

The contention of the Bhāṣyakāra that ignoring the relation of *karma* etc. is *śeṣa*[4] is difficult to accept. For how can an established or obvious relation be ignored ? Besides, why should a fact be ignored at all ? True, the Bhāṣyakāra also has raised this question, but the reply that he has given thereto is hardly satisfying. According to him as in *anudarā kanyā* we ignore the *udara* (belly) despite the existence of the *udara*, so is it possible to ignore the *karma* etc.[5] But it should be noted that there is a difference between the two. In *anudarā kanyā* the *udara* is an unusually

---

[1] *alam iti paryāpty-artha-grahaṇam*, Vārt. on Pāṇ. 2.3.16.

[2] *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*, Pāṇ. 2.3.50.

[3] Pāṇ. 2.3.2.

[4] *evaṁ tarhi karmādīnām a-vivakṣā śeṣaḥ*—Mbhāṣ. on *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*, Pāṇ. 2.3.50

[5] *kathaṁ punaḥ sato nāma a-vivakṣā syāt ? sato'pi a-vivakṣā bhavati, tad yathā—a-lomikā eḍakā, anudarā kanyā iti.....* (loc. cit.).

thin *udara*, and hence it is ignored. But in the so-called cases of śeṣa (*mātuḥ smarati* etc.) the *karma* etc. are not in any way different from those in other cases, and so the question does not arise of ignoring them ; *mātṛ* in *mātuḥ smarati* is as good a *karma* as in *mātaraṁ paśyati* etc.

By *śeṣa* the relations of the owner and the owned, of part and whole, of container and the contained etc. are to be understood, because this was not treated before. Hence there cannot be *śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī* in *caraṇayoḥ* in *bhaje Śambhoś caraṇayoḥ* in the sense that *caraṇa* is the *karma* of *bhaj-*, but the *karma*-relation being ignored (*avivakṣita*), it (=*caraṇa*) takes the sixth case-ending. *Śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī* may be admitted here only if some word related with *caraṇa* in the relation of part-and-whole or inherence (*samavāya*) is supposed to be understood, such as *rāga*, *rajas*, *yuga* etc., so that the full sentence is *bhaje Śambhoś caraṇayor yugam* (or *rāgam* or *rajaḥ* etc.)., 'I worship the pair of feet of Śambhu.' In English too the related word after the possessive case sometimes remains understood ; e.g., I went to Ram's (=Ram's house), to St. Paul's (=St. Paul's cathedral). In Sanskrit also sometimes it is quite obvious that a word has remained understood ; e.g. *niśāmaya tadutpattiṁ vistarād gadato mama* (=*mama mukhāt*). Hence in *bhaje Śambhoḥ* etc. an understood word should be admitted, and *śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī* admitted on the basis of that and that alone, not on the basis of overlooking a *karma*-relation.

Again, *śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī* is pointed out by commentators[1] in such examples as *sarpiṣo jānīte*, *mātuḥ smarati*, *edho dakasya upaskurute* etc., though *karaṇe* or *karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī* is admitted there by the Sūtrakāra. Why should not these be accepted as examples of *karaṇe ṣaṣṭhī* or *karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī*, seeing that some other case-endings also are taken by these *kārakas* ? If *karma* can take *prathamā*, *dvitīya*, *tṛtīyā*, *caturthī*, *pañcamī* and *saptamī*, and if *karaṇa* can take *dvitīya*,[2] *tṛtīyā* and *pañcamī*, they may take *ṣaṣṭhī* also.[3] And this is evident from the sūtras also which clearly declare *karmaṇi* and *karaṇe*, but not *śeṣe*. Of course *śeṣa* may come here by *anu-vṛtti*, but that gives no sense. *Karmaṇi śeṣe* and *karaṇe śeṣe* are meaningless expressions. What are *karma* and *karaṇa* are not *śeṣa* ; what is *śeṣa* is not *karma* or *karaṇa*. It is a contradiction to use *karma* etc. and *śeṣa* for the same thing. It has already been pointed out that *śeṣa* cannot be interpreted as *karmadīnām*

---

[1] including the author of the Great Commentary (Mahābhāṣya).

[2] cf. *akṣān dīvyati*.

[3] *karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī* with *tiṅanta kriyā* may easily develop from that with *kṛdanta kriyā*.

a-vivakṣā. It may be added here that *śeṣa* is not a grammatical term, so that it may have such a meaning. It is the ordinary word meaning 'remainder,' and is used in the definition of Bahuvrīhi[1] compound and *ārdhadhātuka*[2] suffixes too.

It is possible that the interpretation of *śeṣa* as *karmadīnām a-vivakṣā* and the assumption of its *anuvṛtti* in the subsequent sūtras are with a view to making the usual case-endings also available beside *ṣaṣṭhī*. Thus *mātuḥ smarati* and *mātaraṁ smarati* both become possible.[3] This is well and good. But there is no knowing whether the Sūtrakāra intended it. It is also worth-noting here that all rarely used verbs[4] are listed here. Maybe it was idiomatic to use *ṣaṣṭhī* in their *karma* and *karaṇa*, and the need for *dvitīya* and *tṛtīyā* was never felt. But with regard to a common verb such as *smṛ-* the need for *dvitīya* in *karma* is certainly felt, and the opening may have to be there for it. Here again the notable fact is that not the verb *smṛ-*, but *adhi-ik-* is in the list. Why is this rare verb, which is also a bigger word, preferred to the commoner and shorter one *smṛ-* ? This indicates *smṛ-* was probably not intended.

Thus all rare verbs being in the list the need for the normal endings, and for that purpose the *anuvṛtti* and the aforesaid interpretation of *śeṣa* does not arise. Let the rare verbs govern unsual case-endings. It is not necessary to have the usual endings also with them by proposing far-fetched interpretation of rules.

But it is all due to the vague rule itself, *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*. A direct statement of the cases of *ṣaṣṭhī* would leave little scope for a dispute such as this. There is a little discussion in the Bhāṣya about the use of the word *śeṣa* in the sūtra.[5] But both Kātyāyana and Patañjali have sought to justify it. The vagueness that attaches to it escaped the notice of both.

---

[1] *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ*, Pan. 2.2.23.

[2] *ārdhadhātukaṁ śeṣaḥ*, Pan. 3.4.114.

[3] *ṣaṣṭhī* when *karma* is regarded as *śeṣa* ; *dvitīyā* when there is no *śeṣa-vivakṣā*.

[4] *jñā-* (*a-vidartha*), *upaskṛ-*, *ruj-*, *nāth-*, *jās-*, *ni-pra-han-*, *nāṭ-*, *krāth-*, *piṣ-*, *adhi-ik* etc. (Vide Pāṇ. 2.3.51-57 : *jño'vidarthasya karaṇe* ; etc.).

[5] *kimarthaṁ punaḥ śeṣa-grahaṇam ? pratyayāvadhāraṇāccheṣa-vacanam,..... arthāvadhāraṇād vā.....'*, Mbhāṣ. with Vārtikas.

THE LAST WORD

THE LAST WORD

Before concluding, one thing more has be pointed out. Pāṇini, in his interpretation of Sanskrit, has confined himself to phonology and morphology, but has not a word on syntax, strictly, order of words in sentences,[1] with the result that all sorts of cumbrous sentences without any conspicuous, logical word-order are often met with in Sanskrit prose. In later times the rhetoricians have tried to stem this rot by pointing out several syntactical defects such as *samāpta-punar-āttatva*, *vidheyā' vimarśa*, *a-bhavan-mata-yoga* etc.[2] But since these are not stated in any rules of grammar, they are not regarded as constituting any grammatical error, and are often allowed to creep in to the great disadvantage of construction and quick understanding. Thus syntax remains a desideratum in Sanskrit grammar.[3] It is notable that Patañjali's term for grammar is *śabdā'nuśāsana*,[4] as if *śabda*s or words, not sentences also, were the only things that should find place in a treatise on grammar. From this point of view Sanskrit grammarians including Pāṇini may be called *abhihitānvaya-vādin*s, the lone exception being the philosopher-grammarian

---

[1] Some say that order of words in Sanskrit is not a material point for consideration, because the inflection itself shows the relation of words. (Vide Apte's *Guide to Sanskrit Composition*, pp. 1, 263). Pāṇini also might have thought like that. But the result is often chaotic prose and much time is wasted in construing such a sentence. The related words should be placed side by side without unnecessary interventions. This seems to be the real purpose in admitting *āsatti* as a condition of *vākya* by the rhetoricians.

[2] Vide Kāvya-prakāśa, Sāhitya-darpaṇa etc.

[3] The philosopher-grammarian Bhartṛhari has no doubt a chapter on 'sentence' in his *Vākya-padīya*. But it is concerned with the 'meaning', not construction, of a sentence. Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (on Pāṇ. 2.1.1.) contains a definition of *vākya* and a discussion on the difference of meaning in compounds and uncompounded sentences. But that is all. Bhartṛhari's dissertation seems to be inspired by or rather based on, that of Patañjali, as is hinted at in the Vākyapadīya sentence —*sarveṣāṁ nyāya-bījānāṁ mahā-bhāṣye ni-bandhane* (Vāky. II. 479).

[4] '*atha śabdānuśāsanam*'—is the opening sentence of the Mahābhāṣya.

Bhartṛhari who may be called an *anvitā'bhidhāna-vādin* because of his giving priority to *vākya* (sentence) over *pada* (word).[1]

Stated above are the views that can be held in criticism of the Pāṇinian interpretation of the Sanskrit language. They are laid before the Sanskrit-reading world for consideration. With all its limitations, of which the writer is fully aware, the work is a new look on Pāṇini, and, it is hoped, will provide some food for thinking for those interested in the Sanskrit language.

Many of the views expressed here are of far-reaching consequence, and these, if accepted, are expected to open up a new vista of Sanskrit learning. For example, the view that all verbs may be conjugated in both *padas* (*parasmai-* and *ātmane-*), because this was the ancient tradition, will, once for all, set at rest the question of learning by rote the *pada* of every root.

In fine, *ā paritoṣād viduṣāṁ na sādhu manye.....vijñānam.*

---

[1] *pade na varṇā vidyante*
varṇeṣvavayavā na ca,
vākyāt padānām atyantaṁ
pra-viveko na kaścana.

—Vāky., Brahma-kāṇḍa, 73.

APPENDIX

A SELECTION OF BORROWED VOCABULARY IN SANSKRIT

APPENDIX

A SELECTION OF BORROWED VOCABULARY IN SANSKRIT[1]

akaḍama, akūpāra, akūvāra, akkā, akṣoṭa, akhaṭṭa, akhaṭṭi, akkhala, aṅkola, accha, ajāji, ajjukā, ajjhatā, ajjhala, aṭaruṣa, aṭavi, aṭṭa, aṭhida, aṭhillā, aḍakavati, aṇi, attā, anala, ambā, argaḍa, alagarda, alāta, alābu, alīka, allā, avaṭīṭa, avāvaṭa, akalla, ākheṭa, ākhoṭa, āḍāraka, āḍi, āḍu, āḍhu, āḍhyāḍu, āṇaka, āphīṇa, ābutta, āmupe, āyallaka, āraṭu, āraṇa, āraṇi, āripha, āru, āla, āligī, āligu, āśekuṭin, ikkaṭa ikkavāta, iṅgiḍa, icikila, ijjala, iñcāka, iḍikka, idvara, iṇḍarī, iṇḍva, itkilā, itthaśāla, inānī, intihā, indindirā, indambara, indura, impa, irimeda, irimbiṭhi, iribillā, irkuṭa, irvāru, ilava, ilī, iluvarda, illala, illiśa, ījika, īrāmā, īṣma, īṣva, īsarāpha, ukuna, uñcha, uṭaja, uḍu, uḍḍīśa, uṇḍuka, uṇḍeraka, utula, udumbara, undura, -ru, upakkasa, uma, umbara, umbī, umbeka, uruṇḍa, urvaṭa, ulapa, uluṇḍa, ulumbā, ulūkhala, ulūcī, ulūṭa, ulūta, ulūpa, ūni, ūtīka, ūḍala, ūrdara, eḍa, kacu, kaccu, kaṭana, kaḍāra, kadara, kambala, karīra, karcūra, karpāsa, kalka, kalma, karpaṭa, kaṭira, kaṭṭāra, kasipu, kāga, kāja, kāñjika, kināśa, kīlāla, kuṭumba, kuṭṭima, kuṭmala, kuḍupa, kuḍya, kuñji, kuddāla, kuṇapa, kuṭṭanī, kurala, kulattha, kusita, kusindha, kusūla, kustā, kustumbaru, kuhakka, kuhūṇa, kuheḍikā, kūṇakuccha, kūṇi, kūtanā, kūdī, kūddāla, kūlāsa, kūlva, kṛka, kṛkalāsa, kṛkavāku, kṛkāta, kṛpīṭa, kṛmuka, kṛvi, kekala, kecuka, keṇikā, kedara, kedāra, kenatī, kenava, kenāra, kenipa, kenipāta, kemuka, kembuka, kela, kelaṭaka, kelāsa, keluṭa, kevaṭa, kevāta, kevāsī, kevikā, kevuka, kokkaṭa, koṅgi, koca, koṭara, koḍā, koṇa, kotanā, kotha, kotharī, kodāra, koma, komāsikā, koli, kollaka, kolyā, kohaḍa, kohalāsa, kyāku, kyāmbu, krāṇā, krumuka, kvaṅgu, kvapi, kṣamuḍa, khakkaṭa, khagoḍa, khaṭu, khaḍa, khaḍatu, khaḍura, khaddukā, khadira, khaṇa, kharkhoda, kharvurā, khala, khalina, khalureṣa, khallāsaṭa, khalliśa, khasāka, khājika, khāṭa, khāna, khārvā, khiñcā, khidira, khimiḍī, khirahittī, khuṅkanī, khuṅgāha, khuñjāka, khuḍaka, khuḍḍaka, khuralī, khurāsāna., khulla, khulloma, khṛgala, kheluda, khoṭi, gaiṣṭi, gajanavī, gañja, gaḍi, gaḍu, gaḍula, gaḍera, gaḍola, gaḍyāṇa, gabholika, garvāṭa, galaḍā, gali, galū, galodya, galda, galla, gavalgaṇa, gaveḍu, gaveraṇi, gāḍivi, gāḍulya, gāḍeraki, gāṇḍālī, gārugi, gāredha, gārjara, gāladi, gida, gilodya, guggula, -lu, guṅgu, guḍa, guḍacī, guḍākā, guḍuha, guḍucikā, guḍucī, guḍera, gundala, guruṇṭaka, gureṭaka, gurgaṇa, gulika, gulgudhā, gulgulā, guluccha, gūṣaṇā, gṛṇḍiva, geṇḍu, gela, gelu, gocchāla, goji, goḍa, goṇa, goṇī, godhera, goraṭa, goraṇa, golāsa, goliha, golla, golhāṭa, gohālyā, ghamaghamā, gharaṭṭa, gharaṇī, gharinī., ghuṭṭi, ghuṇa, ghulañca, ghuśmeśa, ghūka, gheñculikā, ghoṅga, ghoṭa, -ka, ghoṇā, capeṭā, cappaṭuka, caphaṭuka, cali, calu, cābukā,

[1] For the occurrences of these words vide *Gaṇapāṭha* and the Sanskrit Dictionaries.

Cāmuṇḍā, cikaśa, cikina, cikila, cikkaṇa, cikkasa, cikkiṇa, cikkira, cikhalla, cikhalli, cintiḍi, cipaṭa, cipya, cibi, cibu, cimi, cimicimā, ciraṇṭi, ciri, ciritīka, cihilla, ciru, cilamīlikā, cilāti, cilicima, cilla, civillikā, cihana, cihura, cīāka, cīcīkucī, cīḍā, cīṇa, cīpu, cukkasa, cuṇṭī, cundi, cupuṇīkā, cubuka, cubra, culu, culla, custa, celāna, celāla, celicīma, celuka, cevi, caikayata, caipayata, coka, cokṣa, coca, copaḍa, coska, cauṭayala, cauhāra, chagala, chacchikā, chamaṇḍa, challi, chabillākara, chāchikā, chikkara, chikkika, chilihiṇḍa, chucchu, chuvuka, chemaṇḍa, cheppa, chelaka, chelu, cholaṅga, jakuṭa, jakkarī, jagala, jaṅgiḍa, jajja, jaḍula, jambāla, jikana, jiraṇa, jillika, jivri, jukuṭa, joṭiṅga, jomā, jola, jhalā, jhali, jhalla, jhābuka, khāmaka, jhāli, jhiṅgāka, jhijjī, jhiñjhīma, jhiñjhirā, jhiñjhī, jhoḍa, jhombaka, ṭakku, ṭakkara, -rā, ṭaṭarī, ṭaṭṭanī, ṭaṭṭarī, ṭāka, ṭāra, ṭiṭila, ṭiṭṭibha, ṭiṇṭhiṇi, ṭiṇḍiṇikā, ṭiṇḍiśa, ṭillā, ṭukkarī, ṭuṭuka, ṭunḍuka, ṭunākā, ṭulla, ṭetkārī, ṭera, ṭopara, ṭhakkura, ṭhāra, ṭhiṇṭhā, ḍakkārī, ḍallaka, ḍavittha, ḍahu, ḍāla, ḍālima, ḍāhala, ḍiṅgara, ḍiḍimāṇaka, ḍiṇḍika, ḍiṇḍibha, ḍiṇḍima, ḍiṇḍira, ḍiṇḍiśa, ḍittha, ḍilli, ḍuṇḍubha, ḍuṇḍula, ḍula, ḍūli, ḍoḍa, ḍoḍahī, ḍoraḍī, ḍolā, ḍhāla, ḍhevukkā, ḍhollrī, tarkāra, -rī, takila, taku, takkola, tagaḍa, taḍaga, taḍāga, taḍit, taṇḍurīṇa, tambā, tambīra, taradī, tarambuja, taravī, tarvaṭa, talina, talka, tallaja, tallikā, tavara, taślī, tasīra, tasdī, tājak, tājik, tātala, tābuba, tāmarasa, tāmu, tāmbala, tāmbula, tārika, tārcha, tāliśa, tāvura, tāsīra, titibha, tiṇisa, tintī, titau, titiri, titila, tinikā, tintiḍa, -ḍī, tirigicchi, tirima, tirīṭa, tilitsa, tilvila, tugā, tuṭituṭa, tuṭuma, tubarī., tumura, tumula, tumbara, -ru, turphari, Turāsāh, tusta, tūda, tūpara, tela, taimāta, thakkana, thakkiyaka, thalpāṭaka, damāvandu, daśera, dāḍaka, dāḍhā, diripaka, dīnāra, dumela, dumbaka, duruḥpha, dullala, dūlāsa, dṛkkāṇa, devaṭṭī, dramma, dhaṭa, dhammala, dhammilla, dhalaṇḍa, dhāṭi, dhādu, dhāndhā, dhukkā, dhunḍhuri, nakuṭa, naṭa, naṭṭa, naḍaha, nāḍikela, nāṇaka, nāśira, nāsira, nāhala, nigaḍa, nibiḍa, nerella, nela, neṣṭu, pakkaṇa, pakkaśa, paṭola, paṭṭaṇa, paṭṭiśa, paṭṭeraka, paṇḍālu (cf. *palāṇḍu*), *paṇḍita, panasa, pararu, paraśa, palāva, palakyā, palāṇḍu, pallī, pāgala, pāḍinī, pātasāha, pāratīta, pāreraka, pālāgala, picaṇḍa, piñcā, piñciṭa, picchorā, pilippila, pilu, pilla, piśīla, pukkaśa, pucchaṭi, puṭṭikā, puraṭa, puralā, puravī, purīkaya, pulirika, pulīkā, pulkasa, pusta, pūtara, pūlāka, pūlāsa, pūlpa, pṛkkā, peki, pecu, peṇḍa, peraja, peraṇi, perā, peli, ptā, pnā, psā, psu, phakkikā, phagula, phañjī, phañjikā, phaḍiṅgā, phanijjha, phaṇḍa, phatiha, pharuṇḍa, pharuvaka, pharendra, phalasatīna*1, *phaliga, phalūṣa, phablāku, phaloni, phalka, phalla, phā* (light; cf. Gk. *phos*, Skt. *bhās*), *phāṭukī, phāṇi, phārī, phi, phiraṅga, phu, phuka, phuṭuka, phuḍut, phumpuā, pheñcaka, phela, pheluka, bakura, Bagadāda, baṭaraka, baṭu, baṭṭiśī, baḍavā, baḍiśa, baṇḍa, badaksāna, badvan, baphāra, babavā, babbula, baraṭa barāsī, barīvard, balīvard, barkara, -rī, barjaha, barvaṭa, barvura, barsa, balāmoṭa, balālaka, balāsa, balāhaka, baliśa, balkasa, balla, balśa, balhi, baṣṭa, basta, bahādura, bāhādura, bāḍīra, bādaksāna, bādāma, bārvaṭīṭa, bāliśa, bāhanna, biṭhaka, biḍāraka, biḍāla, bivivā, bivvoka, bukkasa, buḍabuḍa, buḍila, bunda, bundira, buvura, bumbhī, buri, buruḍa, buli, bulva, busta, bukka, bekanāṭa, bekurā, -ri, beṭī, beḍā, bokaḍi, bokkāṇa, bollaka, bohittha, bleṣka, bhakkuḍa,*

bhagala, bhaṭṭa, bhaḍa, bhaḍita, bhaḍila, bhaṇṭākī, bhaṇṭuka, bhambha, -bhā, bharuja, bharuṭā, bhalandana, bhalānas, bhaluha, bhallāṭa, bhallu, bhākuri, bhājak, bhāṭa, bhāraṇḍa, bhāri, bhāriṭa, bhāruṇḍa, bhāruṣa, bhālu, -ka, bhāvaḍa, bhiṇḍa, bhiṇḍimāla, bhirintikā, bhilma, bhilla, bhissatā, bhissā, bhihu, bhīnī, bhuḥkhāra, bhuḍḍa, bhuruṇḍa, bhuśuṇḍi, bhūka, bhṛṇḍi, bhekuri, bheṭaka, bheḍa, bhedra, bheṇḍa, bhelu, bholi, maka, -ka, makila, makuāṇa, makuṭa, makuṭi, makuṣṭa, makūlva, makeruka, makkula, makkola, makṣa, makṣu, makṣuṇa, maganda, magara, magasa, magu, magundī, maghaṣṭu, majumadāra, majiraka, majjara, maṭa, maṭaka, maṭacī, maṭaṭī, maṭu, maṭṭa, maḍaka, maḍāra, maḍūsikā, maḍḍu, maṇa, maṇaū, maṇīca, maṇṭha, maṇḍara, maṇḍūra, matallikā, matasna, matula, madīnu, manaū, manākā., maniṣṭakā, manīka, mandaṭa, mandikukura, mapaṣṭa, maphira, marakata, maranda, marākālī, marāra, marica, mariṣṭaka, marīyami, marīsa, maruṭā, marula, maruva, marūka, maroli, markaṭa, karkara, markasa, malara, malākā, kalika, maluka, maluda, malūka, malla, mallikā, mallu, malva, malha, mavara, maśuna, masaka, masarā, masāra, masī, masīnā, masīra, masura, mahakka, mahalla, mahira, mahilā, mahelā, mahoṭikā, māutha, mākali, mākuli, māghamā, māca, mācala, mājala, māṭaṅka, māṭāsraka, māṭi, māṭha, māṭhī, māḍi, māḍḍuka, māḍhi, māṇa, mātaṅga, māduṣa, māndhāla, māndhīra, mābhīda, māriṣa, māruṅga, māruṇḍa, mārkava, mālasikā, mālasī, mālu, māluda, māluvā, mālūra, mālla, māsana, māsara, māsurī, māhana, māhā, māhīra, miṇmiṇa, miyedha, mirapha, mirā, mirākhāna, mirikā, Milinda, millā, miśi, miṣi, misara, mihira, mīvaga, mukāriṇā, mukābilā, mukuṇṭhi, mukuṣṭha, mukhaṇḍī, mukhulī, mugadasa, muguha, mucalinda, mucilinda, mucukunda, mucuṭī, muculinda, mutava, muttha, muthaśila, mudānādana, mudda, munthahā, muraja, murunṭhaka, muruṇḍa, mulāli, muśaṭī, muśala, muśallaha, musaṭī, musāragalva, musunṭhī, mustu, musra, muhara, muhiṣa, musariḥpha, mecaka, mecaṭika, mecurudi, meṭa, meti, meṭulā, meṭha, meṭhi, meḍi, meḍha, -ḍhī, meṇṭha, meṇḍa, mema, meraṇḍu, meruṭu, meruṇḍā, melu, meśī, meṣūraṇa, meṣka, moṭa, moṭā, moṭi, moṭṭāyita, moṇa, mora, moraṭa, moraṇa, morikā, mokali, maukuli, mauḍī, mausula, yatuna, yāśu, yuyu, yvāguli, rakasā, raḍi, raḍḍa, ramaṭha, ramala, ralarola, ralā, rallaka, ravā, rākhaḍī, rāṭī, rāṭha, rāḍhā, rāṇā, rāṇaḍya, rāyabhāṭi, rāyāna, rāla, rāvaṭ, rāspin, rāspira, rāhaḍī, riḥpha, rikkan, ritakkan, ridhama, rimedha, rihama, rīiyā, rīṭi, riṭā, riḍhaka, rīra, ruua, rubheṭi, rūkhara, rūra, rūvuka, reṭi, rebhaṭi, reśī, roṭī, roḍa, rodākā, ropaṇākā, rora, rola, rolamba, lakaca, lakuca, lukuṭa, lakula, lagaḍa, lagaṇa, laguḍa, laṅgurā, lañchana, lañchā, laṭa, laṭabha, laṭaha, laṭṭa, latva, latvākā, laḍaha, laḍḍa, laḍḍu, laṇḍa, laṇḍu, lapsuda, lampā, lallara, lavaṅga, lavali, laveṭikā, laveraṇi, lasopharañja, lasta, lahakā, lahaḍa, lahika, lohoḍa, lākinī, lākuci, lāṅgala, lāñci, lāḍika, lātaka, lāntakaja, lāpu, lābu, lālā, lālī, lālīla, lālukā, lāvalī, lāvika, lāveraṇi, lāhana, likuca, likhikhilla, ligī, ligu, lindu, livi, livujā, liṣva, līkā, līkkā, līmuṣa, lugi, luṅga, lumbikā, lusta, leka, leṭa, leṭṭa, leta, ledarī, lelitaka, lesaka, loga, loṭa, loṭula, loṇa, loṇāra, loṇī, lota, vakuśa, vekerukā, vakkasa, vagalā, vaṅgha, vacara, vacalu, vaccha, vaṭa, vaṭāku, vaṭi, vaṭibha, vaṭku, vaṭṭa, vaṭhara, vaḍava,

vaḍabhā, vaḍabhi, vaḍā, vaḍiśa, vaḍra, vaṇḍara, vataṇḍa, vatu, vatokā, vadāma, vadāla, vadi, vaddaka, vaniṣṭu, vappa, vappīha, varaṇṭa, varasāna, varāṭaka, varāśi, varisī, varuṭa, varula, varcṇuka, varoṭa, varola, varkara, varkarāta, varkuṭa, varcaṭī, varṇasi, varmi, varva, varvaṭa, varvaṇā, varvi, varvūra, valāṭa, valiśāna, valhi, vavula, vavra, vavri, vavvola, vaśāku, vaśāti, vaśira, vaśīra, vaśmasā, vasāra, vasika, vasira, vahīnara, vahedaka, vāḥkiṭi, vākina, vākucī, vāgara, vāgā, vāgu, vāguji, vāguñjāra, vāguṇa, vāgurā, vāguli, vāgusa, vātāma, vādhala, vādāma, vādāla, vādira, vādgala, vāmarin, vāmalūra, vāmila, vāraṅka, vāraṅga, vāraṭa, vāralā, vāruṭha, vāruḍa, vāruṇḍa, vārūḍha, vārvaṇā, vālāha, vālikhilla, -lya, vāvara, vāvala, vāvalla, vāvuṭa, vāsi, vāsila, vāhataka, vāhādura, vikka, vikhāsā, vicakila, vicikila, vicilaka, viju, vijula, vijjala, vijjula, viñjamara, viñjolī, viṭi, viṭvala, viṭaṅka, viṭara, viṭala, viṭovā, viḍu, viḍḍa, viḍḍhala, vithak, vithura, vituthi, vithyā, vivvoka, viraga, viraṭa, viraṇa, virātaka, virāla, vilalā, vilāta, vilāla, viligī, villa, viśuntha, viścakadra, viṣṭi, vihalha, vihāla, vīnāha, vīḍu, vīlaka, vīsa, vekaṭa, vekuṭi, veṅghara, vecā, vejānī, veṭa, veḍa, veḍhamikā, veṇṭha, veta, vetaṇḍa, vedāra, vera, veraṭa, velava, veluva, veśi, veśvara, veṣka, vesana, vesara, vesevāra, vehata, vehānasa, vaikhānasa, vailhālī, vokkāṇa, voṭā, voṇṭa, voda, vodāla, vora, voraṭa, vorava, vorukhāna, voruvāṇa, vola, volaka, vollāha, vohittha, vauk, vaujhaṭ, vauṣaṭ, varācaṭa, vriś, vreśī, vleṣka, śakaṭa, śakala, śakava, śakuṭā, śakunda, śakura, śakula, śakkara, -ri, śakkuli, śaṭā, śaṭṭaka, śaḍhī, śaṇīra, śatera, śadri, śambaṭ, -ṭī, śaralaka, śarāka, śarāṭi, śarāli, śarāva, śarkura, śalaṅga, śalala, salāṭa, śalāṭu, śalābholi, śalālu, śaluna, śākoṭa, śākola, śākhoṭa, śāḍava, śāṇira, śāṇḍākī, śāpaṭika, śārga, śāha, śāheva, śāhrāma, śikam, śikku, śigru, śiṅga, śiṅgi, śiṭā, śiṇḍākī, śinīvālī, śipaviṣṭa, śipi, śipha, śiphā, śimī, śimya, śimid, śimṛḍī, śimba, -bī, śimbāta, śiriṇā, śirimbiṭha, śilinda, śiviṣṭipa, śīkayata, śīpāla, śīphara, śībham, śībhya, śīma, śutīra, śurāṭa, śuṇṭha, śuṇṭhi, sudi, śumba, śumbala, śūkala, śukāpuṭṭa, śūkula, śūghana, śepāla, śelu, śoṭa, śrīkajāka, śrīṇā, ṣahji, ṣāṭ, ṣiḍga, sakuruṇḍa, saṁkaṭa, saṭālu, saṭi, saṭṭa, saṭṭaka, saṭvā, saṭhī, saḍa, saṇi, satera, sadaka, sadama, samadu, samīdā, saraṇḍa, sarāva, sarka, sarvalā, sarṣapa, salaluka, salavi, saliga, salūna, savahā, saṣki, sahaṇḍuka, sahama, sahāra, sāṭṭāla, sātīna, sātu, sātpuḍā, sāddāla, sānivāpa, sāmunā, Sāyaṇa, sārāmukha, sāṭāla, sāriva, sāristhā, sāru, sāverī, sāha, sāhi, sāhānusāhi, sāhevrām, sigrḍī, siṇḍākī, sidguṇḍa, sipunā, simīka, simba, simbatikā, simbhuka, sira, silācī, silāñjālā, silisilika, sillakī, silha, sivata, sivara, sihuṇḍa, sītīnaka, sīpa, sīvalā, sīpara, sīhuṇḍa, sukkaḍi, sudi, sudella, sunaphā, sunākuta, sunāra, sunāsira, sumpaluṇtha, suraḍā, surisa, sulakkaṇa, Sulatāna, sullā, suśavī, suśeru, sussala, suḍa, sṛdara, sṛdāku, sṛdāgu, sṛpāṭa, Sekandhara, sekaga, seṭa, seṭu, seṭha, sebhya, sera, serāla, serāha, serurāha, sela, selaga, selisa, selu, sehu, sehuṇḍa, sovāka, sovāla, sthagavi, srakka, srukka, hakka, hakkāhakka, haci, haja, hajāja, hajāji, hañcā, hañjā, hañji, haṭṭa, haḍa, haḍi, haḍika, haḍḍa, haḍḍi, haḍḍipa, haṇḍā, haṇḍī, haddā, haddeśa, hanīla, hanīla, harile, hariva, hariṣa, haruṇa, hareṇu, harman, harmita, harmuṭa, haladī, halāhala, halikṣṇa, halibha, halimā, halīna, halīma, haluhāra, hallaka, hallana, hallīśa, havala, hasira, hahala, hahara, hāi, hāu, hākinī, hāḍi, hāphikā,

hāṅgara, hāmpha, hārisa, hikkala, hikmat, hijja, hijjala, hiñjira, hiḍimba, hintāla, Hindu, hindola, hibuka, hirakut, hiraṇa, hirivera, hiruk, hilamoṭi, hilimā, hilihila, hilla, hiṣpha, hīla, hīlanā, huñjikā, huḍa, huḍuk, huḍukka, huḍut, huṇḍikā, huṇḍī, Humāuṃ, huriñjaka, huruk, huruṭuka, hūlahulī, hulu, hulla, huṣṭuta, hūmpha, hūlurāṭa, hekkā, heḍa, heḍāvuka, heḍḍeśa, heramba, heruka, helañji, heli,[1] *heluga, hevara, hevāka, hoiḍa, hoḍṛ, horā*[2]*, holaka, holākā, hrīvera.*

---

[1] Gk. *helios*, Skt. *sūrya*.

[2] Gk. *hora*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SANSKRIT TEXTS

DICTIONARIES

GRAMMAR AND LINGUISTICS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. SANSKRIT TEXTS

Agni-Purāṇa—published by Mansukh Rai More, Calcutta.

Āgniveśya-gṛhya-sūtra—Edited by L. A. Rabivarman, Trivandrum, 1940.

Aitareya-Āraṇyaka—Edited by A. B. Keith, Oxford, 1919; also Anandashram publication, Poona, 1898.

Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa—Edited by Theodor Aufrecht, Bonn, 1879; also Anandashram, Poona, 1896-1931.

Āpastamba-dharma-sūtra—Edited by Chinnaswami Shastri & Ramnath Shastri, Benares, 1932.

Āpastamba-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. by M. Winternitz, Vienna, 1887; also Chowkhamba Publication, Benares, 1928.

Āpastamba-mantra-pāṭha—Ed. by M. Winternitz, Oxford, 1897.

Āpastamba-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. by R. Garbe, Calcutta, 1882.

Artha-śāstra of Kauṭilya—Ed. by Vachaspati Gairola, Varanasi, 1962; also some other editions.

Āśvalāyana-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. by A. F. Stenzler, Leipzig, 1864; also by V. S. Panshikar, Bombay, 1909.

Āśvalāyana-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. by Ganesh Shastri, Poona, 1917; also by Ramnarayan, Calcutta, 1874.

Atharva-pariśiṣṭa—Ed. by G. M. Bolling & J. von Negelein, Leipzig, 1909.

Atharva-prātiśākhya—Ed. by Dr. Surya Kanta, Lahore, 1939.

Atharva-prāyaścitta—Ed. by J. von Negelein, and published in the Journal of the American Oriental Society (JAOS), 1913.

Baudhāyana-dharma-sūtra—Ed. by E. Hultsch, Leipzig, 1884; also some other editions.

Baudhāyana-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. by R. Shama Shastri, Mysore, 1920.

Baudhāyana-pitṛ-medha-sūtra—Ed. W. Caland, Leipzig, 1816; also R. Shama Shastri, Mysore, 1920.

Baudhāyana-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. W. Caland, Calcutta, 1904-1913.

Bhāgavta—published by Gita Press, Gorakhpur

Bhāminī-vilāsa—Ed. Radheshyam Mishra, Varanasi, 1966.

Bhāradvāja-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. H. J. W. Solomons, Leiden, 1913.

Bhāradvāja-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. Raghuvir, Lahore, 1935.

Bhaṭṭi-kāvya—published by Chowkhamba, Varanasi, 1941 ; also some other editions.

Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad—published by Anandashram, Poona, 1891.

Bṛhad-devatā—Ed. A. A. Macdonell and published by Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi (etc.), 1965.

Cārudatta—Ed. C. R. Devadhar, Poona, 1962.

Chāndogya-Upaniṣad—Ed. Ram Sharma Acharya, Bareilly, U.P., 1967.

Daivata-Brāhmaṇa—Ed. Jivananda Vidyasagar, Calcutta, 1881.

Devī-bhāgavata—published by Ksemraj Shresthi, Bombay, Saka 1876.

Drāhyāyaṇa-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. J. Reuter, London, 1904.

Gautama-dharma-sūtra—Ed. L. Srinivasacharya, Mysore, 1937 ; also Stenzler, London, 1876.

Gāyatrī-rahasya-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1954.

Gītā—published by Gita Press, Gorakhpur, Saṁvat 2021.

Gobhila-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. Pandit Mukunda Jha Bakshi, Benares, 1936.

Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa—Ed. D. Gaastra, Leiden, 1919.

Haṁsa-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1964.

Hiraṇyakeśi-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. J. Kirste, Vienna, 1889.

Hiraṇyakeśi-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. Kashinath & Shankar Shastri, Poona, 1907—'32.

Jaiminīya-Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa—Ed. A. C. Burnell, Mangalore, 1878.

Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa—Ed. W. Caland, Amsterdam, 1919.

Jaiminīya-śrauta-sūtra-kārikā—Ed. D. Gaastra, Leiden, 1906.

Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa—Ed. H. Oertel, published in JAOS, Vol. 16, New Haven, 1894—Nagri edition by Pt. Rama Deva, Lahore, 1921.

Kāṇva-Saṁhitā—Ed. Venkat Ram Shastri, Varanasi; also by Pt. Satvalekar.

Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṁhitā—Ed. Dr. Raghuvira, Lahore, 1932.

Kāśikā—published by Chowkhamba, Varanasi, 1952.

Kāśyapa-dharma-sūtra—Ed. Chintamani in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, 1939 ; also Mansukh Rai More, Calcutta, 1953.

Kāṭhaka-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. W. Caland, Lahore, 1925.

Kāṭhaka-Saṁhitā—Ed. Leopold von Schroeder, Leipzig, 1900.

Kaṭha-rudra-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1964.

Kathā-sarit-sāgara—published by Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1930.

Kaṭha-śruti-Upaniṣad—Ed. F. O. Schrader, Adyar Library, Madras, 1912.

Kaṭha-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1967.

Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. A. Weber, Berlin, 1959.

Kauśika-sūtra—Ed. M. Bloomfield, JAOS, 1990, translated and published by Thakur Udaya Narain Singha, Bihar, 1942.

Kauṣītaki-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. T. R. Chintamani, Madras, 1944.

Kena-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1967.

Kirātārjunīya—published from Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1952.

Kṣudra-sūtra—Ed. W. Caland, Leipzig, 1908.

Kumāra-sambhava—published by Pandit Pustakalaya, Kashi, 1959.

Kuṇḍikā-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1964.

Lāṭyāyana-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. Mukunda Jha Bakshi, Benares, 1932; also Ananda Chandra, Calcutta, 1872.

Mahābhārata—Ed... P. P. S. Shastri, Madras, 1931; also some other editions.

Mahābhāṣya—published by Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1942; also some other editions.

Mahā-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1964.

Maitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā—Ed. Leopold von Schroeder, Leipzig, 1883.

Mānava-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. R. Harshaje, Baroda, 1926.

Mānava-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. F. Knauer, St. Petersburg, 1900.

Manu-Saṁhitā—Published by M. R. More, Calcutta, 1952; also other editions.

Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa—Ed. Panchanan Tarkaratna, Calcutta, Śaka 1812.

Matsya-Purāṇa—Ed. Panchanan Tarkaratna, Calcutta, Śaka 1912.

Megha-dūta—Ed. H. H. Wilson, published by Chowkhamba, Varanasi, 1961; also some other editions.

Muktikā-Upaniṣad—Ed. Jivananda Vidyasagar, Calcutta, 1872.

Naiṣadhīya-carita—published by Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1954 (with the title "Niṣadha-mahākāvyam").

Nārada-parivrājaka-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1964.

Nāṭya-śāstra—Ed. M. Ramkrishna Kavi, Rajamundri, 1926.

Nirukta—Ed. L. Sarup, Lahore, 1927; also S. Sarma, Bombay, 1882; etc.

Padma-Purāṇa—Ed. Pannalal Jain, Bharatiya Jnanpith, Kashi, 1958.

Paippalāda-Saṁhitā—Ed. Dr. Raghu Vira, Lahore, 1936-41.

Pañca-rātra—published by Chowkhamba, Varanasi, 1958.

Pañca-tantra—Ed. G. Buhler, Bombay, 1868.

Pāraskara-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. M. G. Bake, Bombay, 1917.

Piṅgala-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1964.

Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa—Ed. Pt. Baldev Upadhyaya, Varanasi (in the vol. Bhāsa-nāṭakāvalī).

Pratimā-nāṭaka—Ed. Pt. Baldev Upadhyaya, Varanasi (contained in the vol. Bhāsa-nāṭakāvalī).

Raghu-vaṁśa—Ed... A. Fridericus, London, 1832; also Hemanta Kumar, Calcutta, 1936; etc.

Rāja-taraṅgiṇī—published by Pandit Pustakalaya, Kashi, 1960.

Rāma-pūrva-tāpinī-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Achaya, Bareilly, 1964.

Rāmāyaṇa—Ed. Kashinath Pandurang Parab, Bombay, Śaka 1824; also some other editions.

Ṛg-Veda-Saṁhitā—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1965; also several other editions.

Ṛk-Prātiśākhya—Ed. Mangaldev Shastri, Allahabad, 1931.

Ṣaḍviṁśa-Brāhmaṇa—Ed. A. Weber, Berlin, 1859; also Satyavrata Samashrami, Calcutta, Samvat 1932.

Śakuntalā—Ed. Haridas Siddhanta-vagisha—Calcutta, 1923; also several other editions.

Saṅkha-likhita-dharma-sūtra—Ed. P. V. Kane, Poona, 1926.

Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka—published by Anandashram Poona, 1922.

Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa—Ed. B. Lindner, Jena, 1887.

Śāṅkhāyana-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. H. Oldenberg, 15 Leipzig, 1878; also Gulabrai Sharma, Rajkot, 1932.

Śāṅkhāyana-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. A. Hillebrandt, Calcutta, 1888-1897.

Saunaka-Caturādhyāyī—Ed. W. D. Whitney and published in JAOS, 1862.

Saunaka-Saṁhitā—Ed. B. S. Satvalekar, Pardi, Surat, 1957 (with the title Atharva-Veda-Saṁhitā).

Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa—Ed. A. Weber, Berlin, 1855; W. Caland, Lahore, 1926; also Gangavishnu Shrikrishnadass Publication, Bombay, 1940.

Siddhānta-kaumudī—published by Pandit Pustakalaya, Varanasi, 1963.

Śiśupāla-vadha—published by Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1927.

Skanda-Purāṇa—published by Ksemraj Shresthi, Bombay, Śaka 1831.

Suparṇādhyāya—Ed. E. Grube, 15 Leipzig, 1876.

Svapna-Vāsavadatta—published by Chowkhamba, Varanasi, 1965.

Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1967.

Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka—published by Anandashram, Poona, 1927.

Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa—published by Anandashram, Poona, 1898.

Taittirīya-Saṁhitā—Ed. Mahadeva Shastri & K. Rangacharya, Mysore, 1896—98.

Upanidāna-sūtra—Ed. Mangaldev Shastri, Banaras, 1931.

Uttara-rāma-carita—Ed. T. Jha, Allahabad, 1961.

Vādhula-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. W. Caland.

Vaikhānasa-dharma-sūtra—Ed. Ganapati Shastri, Trivandrum, 1913 (with the title Vaikhānasa-dharma-praśna).

Vaikhānasa-gṛhya-sūtra—Ed. W. Caland, Calcutta, 1927.

Vaikhānasa-śrauta-sūtra—Ed. W. Caland, Calcutta, 1941 (Bibliotheca Indica).

Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā—Ed. Pt. Ram Sakala Misra, Benares, 1912; also Vallabh Ram Sharma, Nyagrodhpur, 1896.

Vārāha-śrauta-gūtra—Ed. Raghuvira, Lahore, 1933.

Vasiṣṭha-dharma-sūtra—published by M. More, Calcutta, 195 .

Veṇī-saṁhāra—Ed. Julius Grill, Leipzig, 1871.

Vikramorvaśī—Ed. Pandit & Arte, Bombay, 1901.

Viṣṇu-dharma-sūtra—Ed. J. Jolly, Calcutta, 1881; Jibananda, Calcutta, 1879.

Viṣṇu-Purāṇa—Ed. Jibananda Vidyasagar, Calcutta.

Yoga-kuṇḍalī-Upaniṣad—Ed. R. S. Acharya, Bareilly, 1964.

2. DICTIONARIES

Century Dictionary & Encyclopaedia—by W. D. Whitney, London & New York, 1901.

Dictionary of Selected Synonyms from the Principal Indo-European languages—C. D. Buck, Chicago, 1949.

Kannada English Dictionary—by Rev. F. Kittel,

Origins—by Eric Patridge, London, 1958.

Practical Sanskrit Dictionary—by A. A. Macdonell, London, 1924.

Śabda-kalpa-druma (of Rajah Radha Kanta Dev Bahadur)—published by Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1961.

Sanskrit-English Dictionary—by Monier Williams, and published by Motilal Banarsidas, (Delhi, Varanasi, Patna), 1963.

Sanskrit Worterbuch—by Roth & Bohtlingk, St. Petersburg, 1875.

Vaidika-padānukrama-koṣa—by Prof. Vishwabandhu Shastri, Lahore, 1942—Hoshiarpur, 1961.

Viśvakoṣa—By N. N. Basu, Calcutta, B. S. 1299 (etc.).

3. GRAMMAR AND LINGUISTICS

Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages—by R. Caldwell, 2nd edition, 1875.

Grammar of the Sanskrit Language—by Keilhorn, Bombay, 1912.

Greek Grammar—by W. W. Goodwin, London, 1951.

Lectures on the Science of Language, Vol. II—by F. Max Müller, London, 1899.

Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language—by M. Monier Williams, Oxford, 1877.

Sanskrit Grammar—by W. D. Whitney, published by Motilal Banarsidas, (Delhi etc.), 1962.

Sanskrit kā Bhāṣā-śāstrīya Adhyayan—by Dr Bholashankar Vyas, and published by Bhāratīya Jñānpīṭh, Kashi, 1967.

Sanskrit Language—by T. Burrow, London, 1955.

Sanskrit Syntax—by Dr. J. S. Speijer, Leiden, 1886.

Smaller Grammar of the Greek Language—by George Curtius, London, 1873.

Studies on Pāṇini's Grammar—by Barend Faddegon, Amsterdam, 1936.

Technical Terms and Techniques of Sanskrit Grammar—by K. C. Chatterjee, Calcutta, 1948.

Vedic Grammar for Students—by A. A. Macdonell, Oxford, 1916.

INDEX

SANSKRIT
ENGLISH

a-pak-ṣyan, opt. for cond., 171
apa-rādh-, gov. 2nd, 4th, 7th, 198
apa-śabda, 5
apa-tras-ta, 124
apāya, 30
Āpiśali, 36
ārabhāṭa, 9
ā-rabh-et, unP-P, 158
ā-rabh-ya, gov. 2nd, 183
arc-a-yeta, unP-Ā, 153
ardha, 29
ardha-bhāk, 112
ārdha-dhātuka, 206
Ārjun-i, 105
arp-, gov. 2nd, 185
artha, 193
artha-gaurava,
artha-kārśya, 126
arvan, 8
Āryāvarta, 5
āsa, unP-v.f., 148
a-sādhu, 113
a-samāna-kartṛkatva, 60
ās-atha, unP-P, 153
a-smai, 4th in the sense of *for*, 200
āsmāka, 97
a-spaṣ-ṭa, 146
asra, 13, 14, 15
a-sṛj-ata, unP-Ā, 163
aśru,
asru, 13, 14, 15
aṣṭa, 100
aṣṭā, 98
aṣṭau, 98, 99, 100
aṣṭā-viṁśati, 98
ās-te, gov. 2nd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 182
a-sura, 8
a-sūryam-paśyā, unrecog. acc., 90
aśva, 7
aśva-ghāsa, 124
aśva-go-yuga, 76
Āśva-medhika-parva, 79
aśva-tara, 112
a-tiṣṭh-ata, unP-Ā, 161
a-tithi, 88
ātma-nirvede, 7th in *hetu*, 197
attā, 7
atyantāya, 4th in *atyanta-saṁyoga*, 187
aurṇot, 86
avaikṣat, unP-P, 154
ava-lih-yāt, opt. for cond., 171
ā-var, 86
a-vara, 29
ava-skand-a, unrecog. impv., 176
ava-tiṣṭh-anti, unP-P, 161
āvis, 198
ā-viś-ate, unP-Ā, 160
ā-vṛṇ-ak, 86
a-vyayāsakta, 127
a-yā-ma, 90
ā-yatta, 193

bahu-kālāt, 5th in *apa-varga*, 188
bahula, 36
bahu-paṭu, unrecog. comp., 76
bahu titha, unrecog. comp., 88, 89
bhaḍila, 7
Bhāgavata-māhātmya, 126
bhaj-, 204, 205
bhakṣ-a-yīta, unP-Ā, 157
bhakta, gov. 6th, 7th, 199
Bhartṛ-hari, 209 ff, 210
Bhāṣya-kāra, 124, 124ff, 126, 129, 204
Bhaṭṭojī, 126, 127 ff, 177, 185
Bhauriki-vidha, unrecog. comp., 75
bhavad-īya, 115

bhaya- hetu, 30
bhayante, unP-Ā, 157
bhaya-trasta, *bhaga-trātṛ*, unP-comp., 124
bhikṣā-dvitīya, 126
bhikṣām, 2nd in *tādarthya*, 183
bhinna, 102
bhī-, gov. 2nd, 184 ;
gov. 3rd, 187 ;
gov. 6th, 191
bhojana-bhāṇḍa, *bhojana-gṛha*, unP-comp., 124
bhram-ante, unP-Ā, 158
bhram-ate, unP-Ā, 164
bhraṣṭa, 125
bhū-man,
bhū-yas, *bhū-yiṣṭha*, unrecog. pr. suff., 111
biḍāla, 6
Brāhmaṇetara, unP-comp., 124
bubhujuḥ, unP-P, 158
buddhi-ja., 65

cakampuḥ, unP-P, 154
cālanī, 7 ff
cāṇḍālaki, 95
cand-ra, 91
caraṇa-patita, unP-comp., 127
car-ate, unP-Ā, 162, 163, 164
cikrīḍe, unP-Ā, 155
cint-a-yāna, unP-Ā, 155
ciram, *cirasya*,
cirāya, *cireṇa*, undeniable case-endings, 201
culla, 7
cyuta, 125

dā-, gov. 2nd in *sam-pra-dāna*, 185 ;
gov. 7th in same, 196
dadṛśe, unP-Ā, 156
dah-yanti, unP-P, 156
daitya-vadhe, 7th in *hetu*, 197
dakṣiṇa, 29 ; gov. 6th, 190, 191
dakṣiṇāt, 5th in *adhi-karaṇa*, 188
dakṣiṇāyām, unP-c.f., 137
dakṣiṇena, 3rd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 185
daṇḍa-nāyaka, unP-comp., 127
dāśa, *dāsa*, 13, 17, 18, 19
daśāhāt, 5th in *apa-varga*, 188
Devadatta-rūpya, 75
Devīḥ, unP-c. f., 136
dhaivata, 37
dhakṣye, unP-Ā, 156
dhanvan, unrecog. *āgama*, 105
dharaṇī, 147
dhīvara, 18, 19
didṛkṣavaḥ, gov. 6th, 190
Dīkṣita, xxvii
dīnāra, 8
divā, 3rd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 185
divya-śarac-chate, 7th in *apa-varga*, 192
doṣā, 3rd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 185
drakṣyase, unP-Ā, 156, 162
droṇaḥ, unrecog. *lakṣaṇā*, 200, 201
druh-, gov. 7th, 195
druma, 90
dvā, *dvau*, 98
dvā-vīṁśati, 98
dvija-śreṣṭha, unP-comp., 25
dvijetara, unP-comp., 124
dviṣ-, gov. 2nd, 184
dvi-varṣa,
dvi-veda, 114
dyāvā-pṛthivyau, 102

ekādaśa, 75
ekān-na-viṁśati,
unrecog. case-ending, 88

eka-śeṣa, 115, 116
eka-śruti, 36
ena, etarhi,99

gacchasva, unP-Ā, 155, 162
gaḍera, 7
gaḍola, 6
Gālava, 36
gam-, gov. 7th. 193, 194
gāndhāra, 39
Gārgya, 36
garīyas-tara,
garīyas-tama, 91
garjita-parāṅ-mukha, unP-comp. 125
gātra,
ghāsa, 101
ghi, 29, 165
ghoṭa, ghoṭaka, 7
ghu, 29, 165
goṇī, 89
go-goṣṭha, unrecog. comp., 76
go-tama, compar. suff. after noun, 112
gṛdh-ra, 91
gṛh-ṇa, 148
gṛh-ya, unP- *-lyap*, 57, 194
guhalu, 7
guṇa, 126
guru, 36

Haradatta, 38
hārda, 104
has-ate, unP-Ā, 157
hasta-mātra, 76
hāstika, 115
hasti-pāt, 75
hiṁs-ra, 91
horā, 8
hṛd, hṛdaya, 104

icch-āmahe, unP-Ā, 153
iḍikka, 7
īdṛk,
īdṛś, 112
īkṣ-ate, 203
īkṣ-et, unP-P, 154
iñcāka, 7
Ind-ra, 91
Indrā-Varuṇau, compounded duals, 98, 99
indriya-grāma, unrecog. comp., 75
īpsita-tama, 39
īś-et, unP-P, 154
iti, gov. 2nd, 185

jagdha, jagdhavā, 102
jala-da, jala-dhi, 65
jālma, 10
janāntikam, 2nd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 182
jani, jāni, 81, 102
janī, 81
januṣā, 3rd in *apādāna*, 186
jaṭā-bhiḥ, 201
jāti-brāhmaṇa, unP-comp., 123
jāyā, 102
Jayāditya, 172
jayate, unP-Ā, 155, 157, 161
jaye, 7th in *tādarthya*, 194
jighāṁsu, gov. 6th, 190
jīvase,
jīv-eta, unP-Ā, 155
jīvite, 7th in *tādarthya*, 195
jñāne, 7th in *hetu*, 197
juṣṭa, 126

kaḍāra, 7
kahoḍa, 6
Kaivarta, 19
Kaiyaṭa, xxvii, 37, 196

kalaśa, 13, 15, 17
kalasa, 13, 15, 16, 17
kalaśi, 16
kalasī, 17
Kālidāsa, 18
Kalki, 20ff.
kāmārtā, gov. 7th. 199
kamaṭha, 6
kāmena, *kṛt* gov. 2nd, 183
kapī, 81
kāraṇa, *kṛt*, gov. 7th, 193
karīra, 6
kar-iṣṭha, compar. suff. after root,111
karma-kāṇḍa, unrecog. comp., 75
karma-pravacanīya, 36
karṇa-pāśa, unrecog. comp., 75
kartavya-niṣeddhṛ, unP-comp., 127
Kāśikā, 185
kaśipu, *kasipu*, 13
kaśmala, *kasmala*, 13
kath-ayasva, unP-Ā, 154
kaṭhera, 7
Kātyāyana, xviii, 73ff., 124ff, 172, 197ff., 204, 206
Kauṇḍinya, 100, 101
keśa-pāśa, unrecog. comp., 75
keśara, *kesara*, 13, 17
Keśa-va, 103
Kevarta, 19 ff.
kiśalaya, *kisalaya*, 13
kohaḍa, 7
krand-amānāḥ, unP-Ā, 154
krauñca-mithunāt, 6th in *śeṣa*, 189
kriyā-'ti-patti, 170
kṛtyā-'kṣama, unP-comp., 124
krudh-,gov. 2nd, 183 ; gov. 7th, 193
kṣā-ma, 90
kṣam-eta, opt. for cond., 171
kṣaṇa-bhaṅgin,
kṣaṇa-bhaṅgura, unP-comp., 123
kṣaṇāt, 5th in *apa-varga*, 188
kūj-ante, unP-Ā, 154
kukkurāya (*manye*), unrecog. *sampradāna*, 202
kukkuṭāṇḍa, no fem. suff. elided, 114 115
kulāla, 6
kulaṁ-kaṣa, unrecog. acc., 90
kumārāyate, no fem. suff. elided, 114
Kumārila-Bhaṭṭa, 5
kumuda-khaṇḍa, unrecog. comp., 75
Kuṇḍina, 100, 101
kup-yeta, unP-Ā, 154
Kurūn, 2nd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 182, 203
kuṭhera, 7
knṭīra, 91

labh-et, unP-P, 159
laghu, 36
lajj-, gov. 2nd, 185
lakṣaṇā, 73, 109, 110, 111, 117, 201
lavaṇa, 110, 111, 117
līlā-'va-dhūta, unP-comp., 123
lūna, 102

mā, with tenses other than *luṅ*, 171, 172 ; with augmented preterite, 172-173
made, 7th in *hetu*, 197
madhu-ra, 91
madhya-ma, 39, 90
madhyena, 3rd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 185, 186 ff.
Māgadhī, 26
maha, *mahā*, *mahan*,
mahant, *mahas*, *mahi*,
mahī, 98
mahilā, 6, 8

mahyam, 4th with *kṛt*, 188 ;=*for me*, 200
Mallinātha, 125ff
mar-aka, 147
mātā-pitarau, *aluk* comp., 98
mayakā, *mayaki*, 80
me, 6th with *-kta*, 190
Mitrā-Varuṇau, compounded duals, 98
Mleccha, 5, 8, 10
mṛga-kṣīra, no fem. suff. elided, 114, 115
mṛgayām, 2nd in *tādarthya*, 183
mṛtyum, 2nd with *kṛt*, 183
mukhyārtha. 201
muk-tvā, 59
munī, 81
mūṣ, 7
maddha, *naddhum*, 102

na-ga. 114
Nāgeśa, xxvii
naiṣādaki, 95
naktam, 2nd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 182
nāma-nau, unP-comp., 123
nam-asye, unP-Ā, 156
nam-ra 91
narottama, unP-comp., 125
na-saṁhata,
nāti, 114
nava-saptāhāt, 5th in *apa-varga*, 188
nīcaiḥ, unrecog. 3rd, 201
nīca-kaiḥ, 80
ni-dhane, 7th in *hetu* 197
nimeṣāt, 5th in *apa-varga*, 188
ni-pāta, 33, 35, 36
ni-ṣāda, 37
nitya-a-samāsa,
nitya-samāsa, 32
ni-vavṛtuḥ, unP-P, 160
nṛt-yate, unP-Ā, 157, 161

pāda-bhāk, 112
pāda-pa, 65
pāka, 100
pāka-śālā, unP-comp., 124
pak-va, 103
pañca-kapāla, 114
paṇḍita, 10ff
para-ma, 90
parāṅ-mukha, 125
paran-tapa, unrecog. acc., 90
para-rūpa, 104, 146
pareṇa, 3rd in *adhikaraṇa*, 185
pari-hīyeta, opt. for cond., 171
pari-krī-, 203
pari-tas, gov. 6th, 191
paścāt, abl. 201
paścātāt, double abl., 74
pas-paś-ā, *pas-paś-āna*,
pas-paś-e, 146
pat-a-māna, unP-Ā, 157
Patañjali, xviii, 5ff, 8, 14, 26, 52, 52ff, 73ff, 127, 128, 129, 135ff, 144, 145, 172, 201, 206, 209.
pat-a-te, unP-Ā, 157, 162
patau, *pateḥ*, unP-c.f. 137
paṭh-a-te, unP-Ā, 157
pati-nā, unP-c.f., 136
patı-vat-nī, 89
pātre-samita, 127
phā, 8
pilla, *pilu-kuṇa*, 7
pīna, 102
pitṛ-sthāna, 75
piv-a-te, unP-Ā, 157
pra-bhāṣ-, gov. 7th, 194
pra-bhavate, unP-Ā, 158

prabhṛti, 184
prabhu, 203
pra-bhū-, gov. 7th, 195
prajā-sarge, 7th in *tādarthya*, 195
prāk, gov. 6th, 191
pra-karṣa, 185
pra-kāśam, 2nd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 182
prakṛti-kṛpaṇāḥ, unP-comp., 123
pra-māṇa, *kṛt*. gov. 4th, 188
pra-ṇayet, opt. for cond., 171
pra-āp-,gov. 7th, 194
prāpsyase, unP-Ā, 153
prārthayanti, unP-P, 153
pra-śaṁs-ate, unP-Ā, 160
pra-stīma, 90
prati, gov. 4th, 188
prati-jānīhi, unP-P, 156
pratīkṣan, unP-P, 154
prātipadika, 32, 36, 90
Prātiśākhya, 36
pratyaṅ, gov. 2nd. 183
pratyuṣa-kālena, 3rd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 186ff.
pra-vah-ate, unP-Ā, 159
pra-vart-eta, opt. for cond., 171
pra-viś-, gov. 7th, 194
pra-yaccha, gov. 7th, 196
pra-yoge, 7th in *hetu*, 197
pra-yojana, gov. 7th, 192, 193
pṛcch-e, unP-Ā, 157
priyaṁ-vada, unrecog. acc. 90
purā, with various tenses, 175, 175ff, 176, 176ff; 3rd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 185, 186ff ; gov. 5th, 186ff (*spandanāt purā* etc.)
pūraṇa, 125, 126
purasya, unP-c.f., 137
purāt, unP-c.f., 136
puruṣottama, unP-comp., 126
pūr-ṇa, 102
pūrvam, 2nd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 182
pūrva-rūpa, 104
pūrveṇa, 3rd in *adhikaraṇa*, 185, 186ff

rāja-rakṣita, unP-comp., 126
Ramānātha, 18 ff
ramatām (gen. fr. *ram-at*), unP-P, 159
raśanā, *rasanā*, 13
ratna-dhā-tama, compar. suff. after noun. 112
rātriñ-cara, unrecog. acc., 90
roc-, 203
roṣa, gov. 7th, 193
ṛṣabha, 37
ṛte, gov. 3rd, 186
rud-a-māna, unP-Ā, 154
rud-a-te, unP-Ā, 159

śā, Beng. pronunciation, 26
sā, 26
śabdānuśāsana, 5, 209
ṣaḍ-gava, unrecog. comp., 76
ṣaḍ-ja, 37
sah-āmaḥ, unP-P, 161
saikata-līna, unP-comp., 127
sākam, 203
Śākaṭāyana, 6, 36, 52
śak-ta, 185, 195, 203
samam, 203
samānādhi-karaṇa, 32
samāna-kartṛkatva, 56, 60
samantatas, gov. 6th, 199
samāpta-punar-āttatva, 209
samara-patita, unP-comp., 127
samartha, 121
Śambhala, *Sambhala*, 13, 20, 21
śambhalī, *sambhalī*, 21

saṁ-hitā, 36
saṁjñā-pramāṇa-tva, 126
sam-pra-saj-yati, unP-P, 160
saṁ-sparśāt, *kṛt*, gov. 3rd, 187
samudrasya, 6th with *dik-śabda*, 190
sa-nātha, 123
sandhā, root-noun, 66
sanna-tara, 36
sānukrośa, gov. 7th, 195
saptāhena, 3rd in the sense of *after*, 200
śaraṇāgata, 124
śāraṅga, *sāraṅga*, 13, 23
sārdham, 203
sarṣapa-taila, unrecog. comp., 76
saro-ja, 65
sārva-dhātuka, 96, 103
sarvake, 80
śaśa, 25, 25ff.
śaśinā, 3rd with *kṛt*, 187
śasya, 13, 21, 22ff.
śasya, 13, 21, 22, 22ff
sat, 29, 32
sauhārda, 104
śava, 10ff
sa-varṇa, 123
sa-vidhe, 75
savyena, 3rd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 185
savyetara, unP-comp., 124
sāyam, 2nd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 182
Sāyaṇa, 18ff
śayane, 7th with *nī-*, 194
Senaka, 36
senā-praṇetṛ, unP-comp., 127
śeṣa, 125, 204, 205, 206
śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī, 125, 127, 205
sev-anti, unP-P, 161
śīdhu, *sīdhu*, 13
śīkara, *sīkara*, 13
siñcatīḥ, unP-c.f., 136
Śiprā, *Siprā*, 13
Śītā, Beng. pronunciation, 26
Sitā, 26
sma, no past particle, 173, 174
smar-a-te, unP-Ā, 161
smṛ-, 204, 205, 206
snāna-śāṭī, unP-comp., 124
snih-, gov. 7th, 199
spaś-a, *spaṣṭa*, 103, 146
spṛh-, 203 ; gov. 2nd, 185
śrad, 104
sraj-iṣṭha, compar. suff. after root or noun, 111, 112
srak-ṣye, unP-Ā, 161
śreṣṭha, 103, 104
śreṣṭha-tama,
śreṣṭha-tara, double compar. suff., 91
śreyas, 103
śṛgāla, *sṛgāla*, 13
śro-ṣye, unP-Ā, 160
stanita-vimukha, unP-comp., 125
sthānī, 36
stoka-namrā, unP-comp., 122
strī-rūpe, 7th in *hetu*, 197
śudh-ya-te, unP-Ā, 160
Śūdra-jātiṣu, 7th with *kṛtya*, 193
su-gandha, *su-gandhi*, 104
suhṛd-upagata, unP-comp., 125
śūkara, 13, 23, 24ff
sūkara, 13,23, 24, 24ff
śuṣ-ka, 100
śuśrūṣantaḥ, unP-P, 160
su-ṣṭutī, 33
sva-bhāvāt, 5th in *prakṛti*-class, 189
svad-, gov. 7th, 195
sva-māṁsam, 2nd with *kṛt*, 183
śvā-pada, 75
svapna-labdhā, unP-comp., 127

svarita, 38
śvaśura, *śvaśrū*, 25
svasti, gov., 6th, 192
sva-tantra, 39
śyāla, *syāla*, 13, 24
syāt, opt. for cond., 171

tad-anya, unP-comp., 124
tādṛśīḥ, unP-c.f., 136
tap-a-te, unP-Ā, 156
tap-ya-nte, with cogn. obj., 199
ṭi, 165
titau, 7
titikṣataḥ, unP-P, 156
tiṣṭh-āmahe, unP-Ā, 161
tiṣṭh-ante, *tiṣṭh-eta*, unP-Ā, 162
tras-, gov. 3rd, 187
tri-bhuvana-vidhātṛ, unP-comp., 127
tri-rātrāt, 5th in *apa-varga*, 188
tri-saṁ-śayāḥ, unP-comp., 127
tṛp-, gov. 3rd, 187 ; gov. 7th, 192
tubhyam, 4th in the sense *of for*, 200
Turāsāh, 8
tvad-anya, unP-comp., 124
tvayakā, 80
tyaj-a-te, unP-Ā, 156

uccaiḥ, *uccaisaḥ*,
uccaisau, 3rd unrecog., 201
ucca-kaiḥ, fr. *ucca-ka*, not *uccaiḥ*, 80
ud-ātta, 25, 25ff, 36, 37, 39, 99
ud-ay-anti, unP-P, 153, 162, 163
ūdhas, alt. base *ūdhan*, 96
uh-yāmaḥ, unP-P in passive, 159
ulūkhala, 10ff
Uṇādi, 52, 52ff
uñcha-ṣaṣṭha, unP-comp., 126
unduru, 7
upa-bhoga-kṣamā, unP-comp., 124
upa-dhā, root noun, 66
upa-gata, 125
upa-kūlam, unrecog., acc., 96
upari, *upariṣṭāt*, gov. 5th, 189
uparyupari, *āmreḍita* gov. 6th, 190
upāsante, unP-v.f., 148
upāsanti, unP-P, 153
upa-sarga, *upa-sthita*,
upottama, 36
uṣitāḥ, with cogn. obj., 199
uttara, 29 ; gov. 6th, 190, 191
uttara-dāyaka, unP-comp., 127
uttarasmāt, *uttarāt*, 5th in *adhi-karaṇa*, 188
uttareṇa, 3rd in *adhi-karaṇa*, 185

vac-, gov. 7th, 194
vad-, gov., 7th, 194
vad-a-sva, unP-Ā, 159
vādayantaḥ, unP-P, 159
vadh-a, unrecog. root, 103
Vāhīka, 201
vaiyākaraṇa-pāśa, *-rūpa*, unrecog. comp., 75
Vaiyāsaki, 95
vaj-ra. 91
vāk-chūra, 25
vaktā, *vak-tum*, 103
Vālmīki, 163
vām, 6th with *-kta*, 190
vam-ante- unP-Ā, 159
vanādhi-vāsin, unP-comp., 122
vane-cara, 90
Vārāṇasī-Jāhnavībhyām, 3rd with *kṛt* (*saṅgama*), 187
varj-ay-i-tvā, 59
varṣa-kṛtya, unP-comp., 123
Vāruḍaki, 95
vas-a-te, unP-Ā, 159

Vaśiṣṭha, 13, 19
Vasiṣṭha, 13, 19, 111
vasun-dhar-ā, fr. *dhṛ-*, transitive, 147
vaṭāku, 7
vavarṣatuḥ, with cogn. obj. 199
Veda, 14, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 98
Veda-pāṭhaka, unP-comp., 127
vegāt, 5th in *prakṛti*-class, 189
Veṅkaṭa, 18ff
vi-ceṣṭ-anti,
vi-ceṣṭ-ati, unP-P, 155
vid-āmaḥ, unP-v.f. 148
vi-dhā, root noun, 66
vidheyāvimarśa, 209
vidvat-kalpa,-deśīya,-deśya, unrecog. comp., 76
vi-dveṣa, gov., 7th, 195
vidyā-mada, unP-comp., 123
vihā, 6
vi-jay-iṣṭha, compar. suff. after root, 111
viṁśāhāt, 5th in *apa-varga*, 188
vi-mukha, 125
vinā, gov. 6th, 192
vi-nad-ya, with cogn. obj., 199
vi-nard-a-māna, unP-Ā, 156
viraha-vidhurā, unP-comp., 123
vi-ram-a-sva, unP-Ā, 159
viś-a-tām, unP-Ā, 160
viśayāsakta, unP-comp., 127
vi-sṛj-ate, *vi-sṛj-eta*, unP-Ā, 163
viśvake, 80
vi-śvas-, gov. 7th, 199
vraj-eta, unP-Ā, 160
Vṛkodarāt, 5th with *kṛt* (*vadha*), 189
Vṛtra-han, root word, 122
vyadhi-karaṇa, 32
Vyāsa, 163
vyatiśṭhat, unP-P, 161
yāc-a-ti, unP-P, 158
yaj-a-thāya, *kṛt* gov. 2nd (*devān*), 183
Yāska, 6, 18, 22, 36, 52,
yā-syethe, unP-Ā, 158
yāvat, gov. 5th, 189
yoga-bhraṣṭa, unP-comp., 128
yogārūḍha, unP-comp., 122
yoga-vibhāga, 121
yudh-y-āmaḥ, unP-P, 158
yuṣmāka, 97
yuva-jāni, not fr. *jāyā*, 102
yuvati, *yuvatī*, 81

2. ENGLISH

Austric, 9
Avestan, 100

Bengal, 19
Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, 35

Comparative Philology, 15, 17, 101, 102
compound-cum-irony, 76

double feminine, 89
double plural, 87
doubling of suffixes, 91
Dravidian, 7, 9,

Greek, 9, 15, 17, 34, 64, 166

Indo-European, 6, 13ff, 17, 53, 53ff, 113, 114, 164
Iranian, 9

Latin, 15, 17

Max Müller, 25
Middle Indo-Aryan, 35
Modern Indo-Aryan, 26, 35

Nalanda, 8
negative prefix, 114
nomen agentis, 169

paradigms, 144
Paul's law, 102
post-IE, 15

root-noun, root-stem, 51
root-word, 51, 72ff,

Scythian, Semitic, 9
sup-less *pada*, 117

Taxila, 8
Teutonic, 15
two-*mā*-theory, 172

vowel-change, 69, 71, 72, 73